00111879

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 27 February, 2016

A COMPENDIUM

OF

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

BY

DR JOHN C. L. GIESELER,

CONSISTORIAL COUNSELLOR AND ORDINARY PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN GÖTTINGEN.

FOURTH EDITION REVISED AND AMENDED.

111879 ac

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN

BY

SAMUEL DAVIDSON, LL.D.,

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THE LANCASHIRE INDEPENDENT COLLEGE.

VOL. I.

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

: HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.; SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.;
EY AND CO.; WARD AND CO.; JACKSON AND WALFORD, ETC.
DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON.

MDCCCXLVI.

EDINBURGH:
ANDREW JACK, PRINTER,
NIDDRY STREET.

PREFATORY NOTICE.

Dr Gieseler's Compendium of Ecclesiastical History is marked by peculiar excellencies. It occupies an important position of its own. The text is very brief and condensed, marking the results at which the learned author has arrived; while the accumulated materials in the notes enable the reader to see at once the basis on which the statements of the text rest. If the student be not convinced of the correctness of the assertions made by the historian, he can easily draw his own conclusion by the help of what is presented to him. The work is characterised by immense research, and by striking impartiality. In the latter respect, indeed, the author has been blamed by some, his spirit of impartiality preventing him from expressing a decided opinion, where it would be desirable to throw the weight of his authority into the side of truth. There is also an air of dryness diffused over the work, inseparable perhaps from its exceeding brevity, but also indicating a deficiency in vivid sketching. The excellencies, however, far outweigh any minor faults that may be supposed to belong to it. Its rigid impartiality is

its chief recommendation; and the abundant references and quotations in the notes supply the want of a library such as very few have within their reach.

The work in the original consists of several volumes published at different times. The first division of the last volume, containing a portion of the history of the Reformation in different lands, appeared in 1840. In 1844 and 1845 a fourth edition of the first volume was published, one part in each year, greatly improved and enlarged. The author states in the preface, that this volume first appeared twenty years ago, and that during the interval he has not been inattentive to the subject, but has endeavoured to conform his book to the latest investigations. On comparing this edition with the third, we have observed a great improvement, and a large number of new notes.

It may be proper to apprise the reader, that an American translation of the history, down to the time of the Reformation, appeared at Philadelphia in 1836, *professedly* taken from the third edition of the original. The fourth, however, is so different from the third, (if, indeed, Cunninghame's version was made from the latter) that it was deemed desirable to make a new version.

The Translator has adhered closely to the original text. His simple aim has been to give the sense of his author. He has not endeavoured to make the narrative smooth or elegant, for in that case he should have been compelled to resort to paraphrase, Professor Gieseler being by no means an elegant writer. On the contrary, his style is loose, and his sentences evidently constructed without any view to effect. It must be always remembered, that the book is a *text-book*, not an extended history, like Nean-

der's. As such, the Translator reckons it invaluable. In truth, there are only two ecclesiastical histories at the present time that deserve to be read and studied, viz. those of Neander and Gieseler, both *ex fontibus hausti*, as Bretschneider once remarked to the writer. Guerike's is one-sided; and Hase's, alas! is too short. The Translator, on looking about for a text-book which he could put into the hands of his students as the substratum of lectures on ecclesiastical history, could find none so suitable to his purpose as the present; and he accordingly recommended the enterprising publishers to bring out a new version of the new edition, that students might not be obliged to apply to the American translation, the cost of which is very considerable.

It is almost superfluous to state, that the Translator does not coincide with all the sentiments of Dr Gieseler. He has occasionally inserted in brackets a reference to books with which the German professor is probably unacquainted.

Lancashire Independent College,
October 10, 1846.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

		Page.
§ 1.	Definition of the church	1
2.	Definition of ecclesiastical history—its departments—general history of the Christian church	2
3.	Relation of church history to other historical preparatory studies	8
4.	Of the sources of ecclesiastical history	10
5.	The inquiries peculiar to ecclesiastical history	13
6.	Arrangement of the materials of ecclesiastical history—historical representation	14
7.	Value of the history of the Christian church	15

FIRST PERIOD.

TO THE SOLE REIGN OF CONSTANTINE, BY WHICH THE ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE CHURCH IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE WAS SECURED.

I.E. TILL 324.

Sources	17
Works	18.

FIRST DIVISION.

TO THE TIME OF HADRIAN, 117.

INTRODUCTION.

ON THE CONDITION OF THE NATIONS, ESPECIALLY THEIR RELIGIOUS AND MORAL CONDITION AT THE TIME OF CHRIST'S BIRTH, AND DURING THE FIRST CENTURY.

Page

I. CONDITION OF THE HEATHEN NATIONS, § 8 . . . 20

§ 9. Of the religious and moral character of the ancient nations generally 21

10. Religion and morals of the Greeks 23

11. Religion and morals of the Romans to the time of Augustus 24

12. Religious tolerance of the Romans . . . 25

13. Relation of philosophy to the popular religion . . 27

14. Revolution in the mode of religious thinking under the emperors 30

II. CONDITION OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE.

§ 15. In Palestine 35

16. Sentiments of the heathen nations towards Judaism . 38

17. Condition of the Jews out of Palestine . . . 41

18. Samaritans 46

19. Relation of the times to Christianity in its growth . 50

FIRST CHAPTER.

THE LIFE OF JESUS.

20. Chronological data relative to the life of Jesus . . 52

21. Early history of Jesus 56

22. John the Baptist 57

23. Public ministry and doctrines of Jesus . . . 59

24. Alleged contemporary notices of Jesus not found in the New Testament 63

SECOND CHAPTER.

APOSTOLIC AGE TO THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.

25. Early history of the community of Christians till the time of Paul's conversion 68

Page.
26. Paul 71
27. History of the other apostles and their immediate disciples . 76
28. Reception of Christianity among Jews and heathen . 80
29. Internal development of Christianity . . . 83
30. Constitution of churches 88
31. Time of the Jewish troubles 93

THIRD CHAPTER.

AGE OF JOHN, FROM 70—177.

32. Fate of the Jewish Christians in Palestine . . . 97
33. External fortunes of the Christians in the other provinces of the Roman empire 102
34. Arrangements of the churches 105
35. Apostolic fathers 110
36. Development of doctrines during this period . . 114

SECOND DIVISION.

FROM HADRIAN TO SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS. FROM 117—193.

INTRODUCTION.

37. Condition of heathenism 117
38. Fate of the Jews 118

FIRST CHAPTER.

EXTERNAL FORTUNES OF CHRISTIANITY.

39. Its diffusion 120
40. Opposition to Christianity by writers . . . 121
41. Popular disposition in the Roman empire towards Christianity 123
42. Persecutions of Christianity 129

SECOND CHAPTER.

HERETICS.

43. Jewish Christians 133

Page.
§ 44. Gnostics 134
45. (Continuation.) 1. Alexandrian Gnostics—Basilides—Valentinus Ophites—Carpocrates 139
46. (Continuation.) 2. Syrian Gnostics—Saturninus—Bardesanes—Tatian 143
47. (Continuation.) 3. Marcion and his school . . . 145
48. Montanists and Alogi 146

THIRD CHAPTER.

Internal History of the Catholic Church, § 49 . . 152
50. Apologies for Christianity against heathens and Jews . 153
51. Controversy with heretics—Catholic church—Canon of the New Testament 157
52. Development of doctrines—suppositious writings . 162
53. Ecclesiastical life 169

THIRD DIVISION.

FROM SEPTIMUS SEVERUS TO THE SOLE DOMINION OF CONSTANTINE. FROM 193—324.

INTRODUCTION.

54. Condition of heathenism 185

FIRST CHAPTER.

EXTERNAL FORTUNES OF CHRISTIANITY.

55. Disposition of the heathen toward it . . . 188
56. Conduct of the emperors towards the Christians . . 191
57. Spread of the church 204

SECOND CHAPTER.

HERETICS.

58. Elcesaitism of the Clementines 206
59. Struggle in Rome against Montanism, and the Asiatic mode of celebrating Easter 211
60. Monarchians 216
61. Manichaeans 223

THIRD CHAPTER.

THEOLOGY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Page.

I. In the East.
§ 62. Alexandrian school 229
63. (Continuation.) View of the Alexandrian theology, particularly that of Origen 232
64. (Continuation.) Adherents and opponents of Origen 243
65. Other distinguished teachers of the Oriental church . 247
II. In the West, § 66 250

FOURTH CHAPTER.

Ecclesiastical Life, § 67 257
68. History of the hierarchy 260
69. (Continuation.) Hierarchy in the separate churches . 267
70. Public worship 272
71. Ecclesiastical discipline 276
72. (Continuation.) Controversies respecting the objects of ecclesiastical discipline. Felicissimus—Novatian—Baptism of heretics—Meletius—Donatus 283
73. Asceticism 289
74. Moral character of christianity in this period . . 295

SECOND PERIOD.

FROM CONSTANTINE TO THE BEGINNING OF THE IMAGE-CONTROVERSY. FROM A.D. 324—726.

FIRST DIVISION.

TO THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON, A.D. 324—451.

Sources 300

FIRST CHAPTER.

STRUGGLE OF CHRISTIANITY WITH PAGANISM.

75. The advantages conferred on Christianity by Constantine and his sons 303

Page.
§ 76. Julian the apostate 312
77. General toleration till the year 381 . . . 315
78. Suppression of Paganism by Theodosius . . . 316
79. Complete suppression of Paganism in the east—its struggles in the west after Theodosius 320

SECOND CHAPTER.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

80. Introduction 328
I. Period of the Arian Controversy.
81. Beginning of the Arian controversy to the Synod of Nice (A.D. 325) 330
82. Resistance of the Eusebians to the Nicene council till the second Synod at Sirmium (A.D. 357) 334
83. Divisions among the Eusebians till the suppression of Arianism (A.D. 381) 339
84. History of the theological sciences during the Arian controversy 353
II. Period of the Origenistic and Pelagian Controversies.
85. Origenistic controversy 364
86. Controversies with heretics in the west . . . 368
87. Pelagian controversy 373
III. Controversies respecting the Person of Christ.
88. Nestorian controversy 389
89. Eutychian controversy 404
90. On the theological authority of oecumenical councils . 409

THIRD CHAPTER.

HISTORY OF THE HIERARCHY.

91. Growing importance of the clergy 411
92. Dependence of the hierarchy on the state . . 419
93. Origin of patriarchs, especially in the east . . 423
94. History of the Roman patriarchs and of the higher hierarchy in the west 430

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1.

THE CHURCH.

Stäudlin über den Begriff der Kirche und Kirchengeschichte, (in the Göttingen Bibliothek d. Neuesten Theolog. Literatur i., 600). C. G. Bretschneider's systemat. Entwickelung aller in der Dogmatik vorkommenden Begriffe, (4te, Auflage, Leipzig, 1841), S. 749. Dr H. F. Jacobson, über die Individualität des Wortes u. Begriffes Kirche, (in his Kirchenrechtlichen Versuchen, i. 58.)

The Christian Church[1] (ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Matt. xvi. 18, ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ, 1 Cor. x. 32, Gal. i. 13) is a religious-moral

[1] The German word Kirche, which was originally applied to the building alone, is most probably derived from the Greek, τὸ κυριακόν. Walafrid Strabo, (about 840), De rebus ecclesiasticis, c. 7. Quomodo theotisce domus Dei dicatur, (in Melch. Hittorp. de Divinis Cathol. Eccles. officiis varii vetust. Patrum libri. Colon. 1568, fol. p. 395): Ab ipsis autem Græcis Kyrch a Kyrios—et alia multa accepimus.—Sicut domus Dei Basilica, i. e. Regia a Rege, sic etiam Kyrica, i. e. Dominica a Domino nuncupatur.—Si autem quæritur, qua occasione ad nos vestigia hæc græcitatis advenerint, dicendum,—præcipue a Gothis, qui et Getæ, cum eo tempore, quo ad fidem Christi, licet non recto itinere, perducti sunt, in Græcorum provinciis commorantes, nostrum, i. e. theotiscum sermonem habuerint. It appears from Ulphilas, that Greek appellations of Christian things were generally adopted by the Goths, (see Zahn's Ulphilas, th. 2, s. 69, ff.; also aikklesjon, ἐκκλησία, Phil. iii. 6. in the fragments published by Maius). The Greek origin of the word is favoured not only by its occurrence in all German dialects, (Swedish Kyrka, Danish Kyrke, &c.), but also in the dialects of the Slavonian nations converted by the Greeks, (Bohemian cyrkew, Polish cerkiew, Russian zerkow). Other derivations of the word are Kieren, (Kiesen), from the Gothic, Kelikn, a tower, &c. Compare Jacobson's work, s. 68, ff.

society, connected together by a common faith in Christ, and which seeks to represent in its united life *the kingdom of God* announced by Christ, (*τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*). This kingdom it hopes to see at one time realised, and strives to prepare itself for becoming worthy of having a part in it.[2] The church bears the same relation to the kingdom of God as the Israelitish *church* (קְהַל יְהוָה, Numb. xx. 4) had to *the ideal theocracy* expected by it. And as the divine kingdom of Christ is the purified and spiritual image of the theocracy, so is the Christian church the image of the Jewish. Differences relating to the objects of Christian faith and ecclesiastical life early separated the church into various distinct societies, each of which commonly assumed to itself exclusively the name of the "true church of Christ," and branded the others with the titles *heresy* and *schism*, (hæresis, schisma.)

While the old unreformed church associations are continually prejudiced by this *particularism*, Protestants, on the contrary, acknowledge every ecclesiastical society which holds Christian truth in greater or less purity and clearness, to be a preparatory institution for the kingdom of God, and as such belonging to *the universal Christian church*, whose true essence is *the invisible church*, the entire number of all true believers throughout the world.

§ 2.

DEFINITION OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY—ITS PARTS—GENERAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

Casp. Royko Einleit. in die christl. Religions- und Kirchengeschichte. Aufl. 2. Prag. 1791. 8.—Ch. W. Flügge Einleit. in das Studium u. in die Literatur der Religions- u. Kirchengeschichte, besonders der christlichen Göttingen, 1801. 8.

The object of ecclesiastical history is to present in *historical development* the entire course through which the Christian church has passed, and the influences which it has exerted on

[2] The idea of the church is an individual idea, which is given historically, and cannot therefore be brought under the general idea in which it is embraced. See Jacobson, s. 116. Ullmann in the Studien und Kritiken, 1835, iii. 607.

other human relations, and to lay the foundation for a due estimate of it in all its aspects. As time consists of moments, so is history made up of circumstances connected together as cause and effect. Every condition of the church rests on a twofold relation. To its *internal* relations belongs, first of all, that *religious faith*, which forms its bond of union, both in its scientific development and life in the members; next the character of *the public religious exercises;* and thirdly, *the form of government.* To the *external* relations of the church belong *its diffusion*, and its *relation to other associations*, particularly to the state. Though these several relations are not independent of one another, but are developed by constant mutual action, they admit of a separate historical treatment. There arises, therefore,

I. A history of the church's external relations, (*external church history*), viz.:—

1. History of its spread and limitation.[1]
2. History of its relation to the state.[2]

II. A history of its internal relations, (*internal history of the church*), viz.:—

1. History of the doctrines of the church.

(*a.*) As an object of science.

History of opinions, (Dogmengeschichte,).[3]

[1] Jo. Al. Fabricii salutaris lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriens, s. notitia propagatorum christ. sacrorum. Hamburgi 1731, 4to. P. Ch. Gratianus Versuch einer Geschichte über den Ursprung und die Fortpflanzung des Christenthums in Europa. Tübingen, 1766, 73. 2 Th. 8vo. The same author's Geschichte der Pflanzung des Christenthums in den aus den Trümmern des röm Kaiserthums entstandenen Staaten Europens. Tübingen, 1778, 9. 2 Th. 8vo. Ch. G. Blumhardt Versuch einer allgemeinen Missionsgeschichte. Basel 1828 ff. 3 Th. 8vo.

[2] Petri de Marca Dissertationum de concordia sacerdotii et imperii s. de libertatibus ecclesiæ gallicanæ, libb. viii. ed. Steph. Baluzius. Paris. 1663. fol. cum observationibus ecclesiasticis J. H. Boehmeri. Lips. 1708. fol. G. J. Planck's Geschichte der christlich-kirchlichen Gesellschaftsverfassung. Hannover, 1803—1809. 5 Bde. 8vo. The following work is written from a Catholic standpoint: Geschichtl. Darstellung des Verhältnisses zwischen Kirche und Staat von Casp. Riffel. Th. 1. (to Justinian 1st). Mainz, 1836. 8vo.

[3] Dion Petavii Dogmata Theologica. Paris. 1644—50. 4 Theile. 4to. cum præfat. et notis Theophili Alethini, (Jo. Clerici.) Amst. 1700. 6 Theile. fol. W. Münscher's Handbuch der Christlichen Dogmengeschichte. Marburg, 1797—1809. 4 Thle. 8vo, incomplete. The same

History of ethics.[4]

History of the theological sciences.[5]

(*b.*) As living and working in men.

History of religious and moral life.[6]

2. History of ecclesiastical worship.[7]

3. History of the internal constitution of the church.[8]

author's Lehrbuch d. christl. Dogmengeschichte, 3te Auflage, mit Belegen aus den Quellenschriften, Ergänzungen d. Literatur, hist. Noten u. Fortsetzungen versehen von Dr D. v. Cölln und Dr Ch. G. Neudecker, 3 Bde. Cassel, 1832—38. Dogmengeschichte von Dr J. G. V. Engelhardt. 2 Theile. Neustadt, a. d. Aisch 1839. Lehrbuch d. Dogmengeschichte von Dr K. R. Hagenbach. 2 Thle in 3 Bden. Leipzig, 1840, 1841. Other text books by Chr. D. Beck (commentarii historici decretorum rel. christ. Lips. 1801), J. Chr. W. Augusti (3te Ausg. Leipzig, 1820.) L. F. O. Baumgarten-Crusius. 2 Abth. Jena, 1832. (The same author's Compendium d. Dogmengesch. Leipz. 1840). F. K. Meier. Giessen 1840.

[4] Stäudlin's Geschichte der Sittenlehre Jesu. 4 Bde. Göttingen 1799—1823 (reicht bis 1299). The same author's Gesch. d. christl. Moral seit dem Wiederaufleben d. Wissenschaften. Göttingen 1808. W. M. L. de Wette christliche Sittenlehre, 2ter Theil: Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Sittenlehre, in 2 Hälften. Berlin 1819—21. 8. Stäudlin's Monographieen: Gesch. d. Vorstellungen v. der Sittlichkeit des Schauspiels. Gött. 1823. Gesch. d. Vorstell. u. Lehren vom Selbstmorde. Ebend. 1824. v. Eide. Ebend. 1824. v. Gebete. Ebend. 1824. v. Gewissen. Halle 1824. v. d. Ehe. Gött. 1826. v. d. Freundschaft. Hannover 1826. 8.

[5] Ch. W. Flügge's Geschichte der theol. Wissenschaften. Halle 1796—98. 3 Thle. 8. (as far as the Reformation.) K. F. Stäudlin's Gesch. der theol. Wissenschaften seit der Verbreitung der alten Literatur. Göttingen 1810—11. 2 Thle. 8.

[6] The history of religious and moral life among Christians is difficult, and has been neglected down to the latest times. Formerly there appeared only one-sided representations of the life of the first Christians, for example, by W. Cave, Gottfr. Arnold, Peter Zorn. The history of morals is interwoven with it in K. F. Stäudlin's history of the moral teaching of Christ. (Geschichte der Sittenlehre Jesu; see note 4.) For the history of Christian life see Neander's Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Geschichte des Christenthums und des christlichen Lebens. Berlin, 1823 ff. 3 vols. [A third edition of the first volume has been lately published.]

[7] Edm. Martene De antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus. 3te sehr verm. Aufl. Antverp 1736—38. 4 Thle. fol. C. Schöne Geschichtsforschungen über die kirchl. Gebräuche u. Einrichtungen der Christen. Berlin 1819 ff. [Only three volumes are yet published.]

[8] L. Thomassini Vetus et Nova Ecclesiae Disciplina circa beneficia et beneficiarios. Lucae 1728. 3 Thle. fol. Planck's Gesch. der Christl. kirchl. Gefellschaftsverfassung (see above note 2).

A description of *the worship, ecclesiastical usages,* and *constitution* of the ancient church, is included in the somewhat vague appellation, *ecclesiastical antiquities,* or *archaeology,*[9] although these departments do not embrace merely one point of time, but a longer or shorter period, and ought therefore to belong to history.

The materials of ecclesiastical history are also divided by a reference to particular *countries,* and to separate *ecclesiastical societies,*[10] whose special developments are presented in *special histories.* But yet the progress of development, both in regard to separate ecclesiastical relations, and also the separate ecclesiastical societies of particular lands, occupies a position in which mutual influences are constantly affecting the history in a greater or less degree; so that no special history, or description of individual ecclesiastical relations, can be wholly separated from the other history. It is the object of *the general history of*

[9] Origines Ecclesiasticae, or the Antiquities of the Christian Church, by Joseph Bingham. A new edition, 8 vols. 8vo. London 1839, ff. Jos. Binghami Origines sive Antiquitates Ecclesiasticae ex. angl. lat. redditae a J. H. Grischovio. Halae 1724—38. 11 vol. 4. J. C. W. Augusti's Denkwürdigkeiten aus d. Christl. Archäologie. Leipz. 1817, ff. 12 Bde. The same author's Handbuch d. Christl. Archäologie. Ebend. 1836 ff. 3 Bde. F. H. Rheinwald's Kirchl. Archäologie. Berlin, 1830. Böhmer's Christl. Kirchl. Alterthumswissenschaft. Breslau, 1836. 2 Bde. From Catholic authors we have F. Th. Mamachii Originum et Antiquitatum Christianorum libb. xx. There have only appeared libb. iv. Romae 1749—55. 4. J. L. Selvaggii Antiquitatum Christianarum Institutiones libb. iii. in 6 partibus. Neapoli 1772—74. 8. Alex. Aur. Pelliccia de Christ. Ecclesiae primae, mediae et novissimae aetatis politia libb. vi. Neapoli 1777. 3 Bde. 8. ed. nova, cura J. J. Ritteri et Braunii. 2 T. Colon. 1829. 38. 8. A German translation by A. J. Binterim: Die Vorzüglichsten Denkwürdigkeiten der Christ-Kathol. Kirche, mit bes. Rücksichtnahme auf d. Disciplin d. Kath. K. in Deutschland. Mainz 1825, ff. 7 Thle. in 17 Bden. Locherer Lehrb. d. Christl. Archäologie. Frankf. 1832.

[10] The history of parties separated from the catholic Church has been confined with too much one-sidedness merely to their controversies with the catholic Church. C. W. F. Walch's Vollständige Historie der Ketzereien, Spaltungen u. Religionsstreitigkeiten bis auf die Reformation. Leipzig 1762. 11 Thle. 8. (reaching as far as the image-controversy.) [Lardner's History of the Heretics. Burton's Inquiry into the Heresies of the Apostolic Age, being the Bampton Lecture for 1829.]

[11] Works on the general history of the Christian Church.

I. BY PROTESTANT WRITERS:

Ecclesiastica historia—congesta per aliquot studiosos et pios viros in urbe Magdeburga. Basil. 1559—74. 13 Bde. fol. (embraces thirteen

the Christian church,[11] to develop the general steps in its progress, so that its relation to the ideal of the church, the kingdom of God, may be perceived. Accordingly, such historical data

centuries), usually called Centuriæ Magdeburgenses. The new edition by Semler, (Norimb. 1757 ff. 6 voll. 4.), is incomplete.

J. H. Hottingeri Hist. Ecclesiastica Novi Testamenti. Hanov. et Tiguri 1655—67. 9 Thle. 8., to the end of the sixteenth century.

J. L. Mosheim Institutionum Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Antiquæ et Recentioris libb. iv. Helmst. 1755. 4. (Mosheim's Vollständige Kirchengeschichte, frei übersetz u. mit. Zusatzen von J. A. Cp. v. Einem. Leipzig, 1769—78. 9 Thle. 8. Von J. R. Schlegel. Heilbr. u. Rothenb. 1770—96. 7 Bde. 8.) [Translated into English by Maclaine, with notes, and frequently reprinted. Also by James Murdock, D.D., 3 vols. 8vo, third edition, 1841.

J. S. Semler Historiæ Eccles. selecta capita cum epitome canonum, excerptis dogmaticis et tabulis chronologicis. Halæ 1773—78. 3 Bde. 8., to the end of the fifteenth century.

H. Venema Institutiones Hist. Ecclesiæ Vet. et Novi Testam. Lugd. Batav. 1777—83. 7 Thle., to the end of the sixteenth century.

J. Matth. Schröckh's Christl. Kirchengeschichte bis zur Reformation. Leipzig 1768—1803. 35 Thle. 8. The same author's Kirchengesch. seit der Reformat. Ebend. 1804—10. 10 Thle. 8., (ninth and tenth parts by H. G. Tzschirner.)

H. P. C. Henke's Allgemeine Gesch. der Christl. Kirche, fortgesetzt von J. S. Vater. Braunschweig, 1788—1820. 8 Thle. 8., of the first and second parts, the fifth edition, 1818—20; of the third and fourth, the fourth edition, 1806. The history since the Reformation (parts 3—8) has also been compressed into a third volume, 1823.

J. E. Ch. Schmidt's Handbuch der Christlichen Kirchengeschichte. Giessen 1801—20. 6 Thle. (Th. 1—4, 2te Aufl. 1825—27), continued by F. W. Rettberg. Th. 7. 1834, reaches to 1305.

A. Neander's Allgem. Geschichte der Christl. Religion u. Kirche. Hamb. 1825 ff. 8. bis Bd. 5. Abth. 1. in 9 Thlen, geht bis 1300, (new edition, of Bd. 1. Abth. 1. in 2 Bden. 1842 u. 43). [Two volumes, embracing the first three centuries, have been translated from the first edition, by Henry John Rose.]

H. E. F. Guerike's Handb. der Allgem. Kirchengesch. 2 Bde. Halle 1833, (5te Aufl. 1843).

J. G. V. Engelhardt's Handbuch der Kirchengesch. 4 Bde. Erlangen, 1833, 34.

A. F. Gfrörer's Allgem. Kirchengesch. für die Deutsche Nation. 2 Bde. (Stuttgart, 1841).

Manuals by J. M. Schröckh, (Hist. Relig. et Eccles. Christ. 1777. ed. 7. cura Ph. Marheinecke. Berol. 1828), L. T. Spittler, (Gött. 1782. 5te Aufl. bes. v. G. J. Planck, 1812), J. E. Chr. Schmidt, (Giessen 1800. 3te Aufl. 1826), W. Münscher, (Marburg, 1804. 2te Aufl. v. L. Wachler, 1815. 3te Aufl. v. M. J. H. Beckhaus, 1826), K. F. Stäudlin, (Hann. 1806. 5te Aufl. v. Holzhausen, 1833), J. T. L. Danz, (2 Thle. Jena, 1818—26). K. Hase, (Leipz. 1834. 4te Aufl. 1841). P. Hofstede de Groot. Groningæ, 1835, H. J. Royaards fasc. 1. Traj. ad Rh. 1840. as far as 5120.

alone as refer to this general progress, are important in its view; while those data which have only a more limited significance, are left to special histories.

J. S. Vater's Synchronist. Tafeln der Kirchengesch. Halle 1803. 4te Aufl. 1825. fol.

[English works are, Priestley's General History of the Christian Church to the present time, 6 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1780—1803. Milner's Church History, continued by J. Scott. Jones's History of the Christian Church. Waddington's History, originally published in the Library of Useful Knowledge; to which was afterwards added, a History of the Reformation, in 3 vols. See also Campbell's Lectures on Ecclesiastical History.]

II. BY CATHOLIC WRITERS.

Caes. Baronii Annales Ecclesiastici. Romæ 1588—1607. 12 Bde. fol. reaches to 1198; the edition of Mogunt. 1601, was improved by the author himself, and has consequently been made the basis of succeeding editions. Among the continuators of Baronius, has been most valued Odoricus Raynaldus. Ann. Eccles. Tom. xiii.—xxi. Rom. 1646—77. (Tom. xxi. was suppressed by Romish censorship till 1689. Of Tom. xiii.—xx. a new and improved edition was published by the author at Colon. 1693 ss.), reaches to 1565. This was continued by Jac. de Laderchio. Ann. Eccl. T. xxii.—xxiv. Rom. 1728—37, embracing the years 1566—71.

Other continuations of Baronius are those of Abr. Bzovii. Rom. 1616. Tomi viii. to 1564, (improved edition. Colon. 1621 ss.), and that of Henr. Spondani. Paris. 1640—41. Tomi ii. to 1640. Critiques: Is. Casauboni Exercitationes XVI. ad Card. Baronii prolegom. Londini 1614, fol. continued by Sam. Basnagius: Exercitationes,—in quibus Card. Baronii Annales ab anno Christi XXXV., in quo Casaubonus desiit, expenduntur. Ultraj. 1692, also 1717. 4. Anton. Pagi critica historico-chronologica in annales Baronii ed. Franc. Pagi. Antverp, properly Geneva, 1705, also 1727. T. iv. fol.

A great edition of Baronii Annales, Raynaldi continuatio, Pagii critica, and of other smaller writings, by Dom. Ge. and Jo. Dom. Mansi. Lucæ 1738—59. 38 Bde. fol.

Natalis Alexandri Hist. Eccles. Vet. et Novi Testamenti. Paris. 1699. 8 Bde. fol. (reaches to the end of the 16th century). Claude Fleury Histoire Ecclesiastique. Paris, 1691—1720. 20 Bde. 4, (reaches to 1414), continued by Jean Claude Fabre. Paris, 1726—40, 16 Bde. 4. Casp. Sacharelli Historia Ecclesiastica. Rom, 1772—95. 25 voll. 4. Fr. L. Graf v. Stolberg: Geschichte der Religion Jesu. Hamburg, 1806—19. 15 Bde. 8, continued by F. v. Kerz. Mainz 1825 ff. Th. 16—38, down to the 12th century. Th. Katerkamp's Kirchengeschichte. Münster, 1819—34. 5 Bde. to 1153. J. N. Locherer's Gesch. d. Christl. Rel. u. Kirche. 9 Thle. Ravensburg, 1824 ff. to 1073. J. N. Hortig's Handbuch d. Christl. Kirchengesch. beendigt von J. J. J. Döllinger. 2 Bde. Landshut, 1826—28. A new working up of the materials: Döllinger's Gesch. d. Christl. Kirche. Bd. 1 in 2 Abtheil.

§ 3.

RELATION OF CHURCH HISTORY TO OTHER HISTORICAL STUDIES.

Ecclesiastical history forms a part of *the general history of culture*[1] and *of religion*,[2] and requires attention to other departments of study, that we may judge rightly of the importance of Christianity in relation to general culture, and of its opposition to other religions. It is scientifically co-ordinate with *political history*,[3] *the history of philosophy*,[4] and *the history of literature*,[5]

Landshut, 1833. 35, partly to 680. J. J. Ritter's Handb. der Kirchengesch. Elberfeld 1826 ff. 3 Bde. to 1792. (Bd. 1. u. 2. 2te Aufl. Bonn 1836). J. O. Ritter v. Rauscher Gesch. der Christlichen Kirche. Salzburg, 1829. 2 Bde. to 313. Jac. Ruttenstock Instit. Hist. Eccl. N. T. 3 T. Viennæ 1832 ss. to 1517. J. Annegarn Gesch. d. Christl. Kirche. Münster 1842 f. 3 Thle. to 1841.

Manuals by Matthias Dannenmayr, (Institutt. h. e. N. T. Viennæ, 1788. ed. 2. 1806. 2 voll.), Fr. Xav. Gmeiner, (Epitome h. e. N. T. 2 voll. ed. 2. Grätz 1803). Ant. Michl. (Christl. K. G. 2 Bde. München, 1807. 11. 2te Aufl. 1811. 19). Döllinger. Landshut 1836 ff. (Bd. 1. u. Bd. 2. Abthl. 1, partly to 1517). Joh. Alzog, (2te Aufl. Mainz 1843).

[1] J. G. Herder's Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte d. Menschheit. Riga u. Leipzig 1784—91. 4 Thle. 8. J. G. Gruber's Gesch. des Menschl. Geschlechts a. d. Gesichtspunkte der Humanität. Leipzig 1806. 7. 2 Bde. 8.

[2] Bernh. Picard Cérémonies et Coutumes Religieuses de tous les peuples du monde. Amsterd. 1723—53. 9 vols. fol. F. H. St Delaunaye Histoire générale et particulière des Religions et du Culte de tous les peuples du monde. Paris 1791. 2 T. 4. Ch. Meiners Allg. Krit. Geschichte der Religionen. Hannover 1806. 7. 2 Bde 8. F. Mayer Gesch. aller Religionen, als Mythologisches Taschenbuch. Weimar 1811. 8.

[3] Universal History, 60 vols. 8vo. London 1747—63. Translated into German by Baumgarten and Semler, and continued by a society of learned men in Germany and England (A. L. Schloezer, L. A. Gebhardi, E. Tozen, J. G. Meusel, J. F. Le Bret, F. Rühs, and others). 1771—1810. A collection of explanatory writings and additions to the Universal History was published at Halle, 1747—65, in 6 Theile 4to.

History of the European States, published by A. H. L. Heeren and F. A. Ukert. Hamburg 1829 ff. Up to the present time have appeared—History of the Germans, by J. C. Pfister, 5 vols.; of the Austrian empire, by J. Count Mailath, 2 vols.; of the Prussian empire, by G. A. H. Stenzel, 3 vols.; Saxony, by C. W. Boettiger, 2 vols.; Portugal, by H. Schaefer, 2 vols.; Spain, by F. W. Lembke, 1 vol.; France, by E. Al. Schmidt, 2 vols.; France in the time of

with which it stands in so close relationship, that, to be fully understood, it can as little dispense with their aid as they can dispense with it. . Besides, it requires, as other historical studies do, *historical geography*,[6] *chronology*,[7] *philology*,[8] *diplomacy*,[9]

the Revolution, by W. Wachsmuth, 3 vols.; Italy, by H. Leo, 5 vols.; England, by J. M. Lappenberg, 2 vols.; the Netherlands, by Van Kampen, 2 vols.; Denmark, by F. C. Dahlmann, 3 vols.; Sweden, by E. G. Geijer, 3 vols.; Poland, by R. Röpell, 1 vol.; Russia, by Ph. Strahl., 2 vols.; the Osmans, by Zinkeisen, 1 vol. C. F. Schlosser's Weltgeschichte in zusammenhängender Erzählung, 4 volumes, are already published in seven parts (down to the year 1409). Frankf. on the Maine 1815—41, 8vo.

[4] Jac. Bruckeri Historia Critica Philosophiae. Lips. 1741—67. 6 Bde. 4. D. Tiedemann's Geist der Speculativen Philosophie. Marb. 1791—97. 6 Bde. 8. J. G. Buhle's Lehrbuch der Gesch. der Philosophie. Gött. 1796—1804. 8 Thle. 8. The same author's Gesch. der neuern Philosophie seit der Epoche d. Wiederherstellung d. Wissensch. Ebend. 1800—5. 6 Bde. 8. W. G. Tennemann's Gesch. d. Philosophie. Leipzig 1798—1820. 11 Bde. 8. H. Ritter's Gesch. der Philosophie. (Th. 5. u. 6. Gesch. der Christl. Philosophie.) Hamburg 2te Aufl. 1837 ff.

[5] L. Wachler's Allgem. Gesch. der Literatur. 3te Umarbeitung. Frankf. a. M. 1833. 4 Thle. gr. 8.

[6] For this the following are useful:—Chr. Kruse's Atlas zur Gesch. aller Europ. Länder u. Staaten von ihrer ersten Bevölkerung an bis auf die neuesten Zeiten. 6te Ausg. Halle 1841. 4 Hfte Fol. K. v. Spruner's Historisch-Geographischer Handatlas. Gotha 1837 ff. bis jetzt 6 Lieferungen in 47 Charten.

[7] The general works on chronology: J. Ch. Gatterer's Abrisz der Chronologie. Göttingen 1777. 8. L'Art de vérifier les Dates des Faits Historiques &c. par un religieux Bénédictin. Paris 1750. 3 Thle. 4. In the latest edition it appeared par Mr Viton de Saint-Alais in two parts; L'Art &c. avant l'ère Chrétienne, 5 Tomes;—L'Art &c. depuis la Naissance de notre Seigneur, 18 Tomes. Paris 1818 u. 19. 8. Dr L. Ideler's Handbuch der mathemat. u. technischen Chronologie. 2 Bde. Berlin 1825, 26. The same author's Lehrbuch der Chronologie. Ebend. 1831. Dr Ed. Brinckmeier's prakt. Handbuch der Histor. Chronologie. Leipzig 1843.

In addition to the well-known chronological distinctions ab urbe condita, according to the consuls, emperors, &c., the following eras are important in church history. Æra contractionum or Seleucidarum, beginning B.C. 312, 1st October, formerly the most common in the east, and to this day the ecclesiastical era of the Syrian Christians. Æra Hispanica begins 716 A.U.C. 38 B.C., abolished in Spain in the fourteenth century, in Portugal not until 1415. Æra Diocletiana or æra Martyrum, begins 29th August A.D. 284, used in the Christian Roman empire, and still current among the Copts. Cyclus indictionum, a fifteen year's cycle constantly recurring, which first began on the 1st September 312, but in the middle ages assumed the usual commencement of the year.

numismatics, heraldry, and derives *special assistance from ecclesiastical geography and statistics.*[10]

§ 4.

OF THE SOURCES OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

The sources of ecclesiastical history, like those of every other

Æra Constantinopolitana reckons after the creation of the world, the 1st September 5508 B.C., since the council of Trulla, (692), in civil use among the Greeks, among the Russians abolished in 1700. Besides, the different commencements of the year must be noticed in the reckoning of time. Comp. Ideler's Handbuch ii., 325 ff.

[8] For the later Greek and Latin generally: C. du Fresne Glossarium ad Scriptores mediæ et infimæ Græcitatis. Lugd. 1688. 2 Tom. fol. C. du Fresne Glossar. ad Scriptores mediæ et infimæ Latinitatis. Edit. nova operâ et stud. Monachorum ord. S. Bened. Paris. 1733—36. 6 Voll. fol. P. Carpentier Glossar. novum ad Scriptores med. ævi cum Latinos tum Gallicos. Paris. 1766. 4 Voll. fol. Glossar. manuale ad Scriptores mediæ et infimæ Latinitatis, (by J. C. Adelung.) Hal. 1772—84. 6 Voll. 8. Here also belong all glossaries for the dialects of the middle ages. As every department of life and science has its peculiar ideas and expressions, so in like manner the Christian church. For this ecclesiastical and theological terminology, which cannot indeed fitly lay the foundation of an ecclesiastical philology as a peculiar study, comp. J. C. Suiceri Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus e patribus Græcis. Second edition. Amsterd. 1728. 2 vols. fol. C. L. Baueri Glossarium Theodoreteum, appended to Schulz's edition of Theodoret, (Halle, 1774), and Index latinitatis Tertullianeæ, by Schütz and Windorf, annexed to Semler's edition of Tertullian, (Halle, 1776).

[9] General works on Diplomatics: J. Mabillon De Re Diplomatica. ed. 2. Paris. 1709. Supplem. 1704. Nouveau Traité de Diplomatique par deux relig. Bénédictins de la Congr. de St Maur. (Toustain et Tassin.) Paris, 1750—65. 6 voll. 4. Gatterer's Abriss der Diplomatik. Gött. 1798. 8. K. T. G. Schönemann's Vollständiges System der Allgemeinen Diplomatik Hamb. 1801. 2 Bde. 8.

[10] Caroli a S. Paulo Geographia Sacra s. notitia antiqua dioeceseon omnium veteris ecclesiæ, cur. J. Clerico. Amstel. 1703. fol. Fr. Spanhemii Geograph. Sacra et Eccles (Opp. T. i. Lugd. Bat. 1701.) Bingham Origg. Eccl. lib. ix. For later times: K. F. Stäudlin's Kirchl. Geographie u. Statistik. Tübingen 1804. 2 Thle. 8. Kirchl. Statistik von Dr Jul. Wiggers. 2 Bde. Hamburg u. Gotha, 1842.

Atlas Antiquus Sacer, ecclesiasticus et profanus, collectus ex tabulis geographicis Nic. Sansonis. Tabulas emendavit J. Clericus. Amstel. 1705. fol. Atlas Sacer s. Ecclesiasticus descriptus a J. E. Th. Wiltsch. Gotha 1843. fol.

history, may be traced back to *private testimony, original documents*, and *monuments*. To the first belong not only *the records of ecclesiastical events which are original to us*,[1] and *biographies* of remarkable persons in the history of Christianity, particularly of hierarchs[2] and saints,[3] but also other *works of Christian writers*, especially *the theological*,[4] and even *many writings pro-*

[1] Literary History of Ecclesiastical History, see C. Sagittarii Introductio in Historiam Ecclesiasticam. Jenæ, 1718. Tom. i. 4, with the supplements in Tom. ii., (curante J. A. Schmidio, 1718,. p. 1—706. Ch. W. F. Walch's Grundsätze der zur Kirchenhistorie des N. T. nöthigen Vorbereitungslehren u. Bücherkenntniss. Gött. 1773. 8. Schröckh's Kirchengesch. Bd. 1. S. 141 ff. C. F. Stäudlin's Geschichte u. Literatur der Kirchengesch, herausgeg. v. J. T. Hemsen. Hannover 1827, 8. Comp. the works about to be quoted in Note 4 below.

[2] Especially of the popes. The oldest collection of the biographies of them is Anastasii Bibliothecarii (abbot in Rome about 870) Liber Pontificalis. This, together with the following collections, has been inserted in Muratorii Rerum Ital. Scriptores, T. iii.

[3] Existing in great numbers, but only to be used with great caution. Acta Sanctorum, quotquot toto orbe coluntur. Antverp. 1643—1794, 53 vols. fol. A work of the Antwerp Jesuits,—Jo. Bolland, (he began it; hence the publishers are called Bollandists), God. Henschenius, Dan. Papebrochius, &c., arranged according to the days of the month. The 53d volume contains the 6th of October. The apparatus collected for the work, which was long unknown, to which alone about 700 MSS. belong, came to Brussels from the abbey Tongerloo, in the Bibliothèque de Bourgogne. Since 1839 the Jesuits have been working upon the continuation in Tongerloo at the expense of the Belgian government. De Prosecutione Operis Bollandiani, quod Acta Sanctorum inscribitur. Namur, 1838. 8. Mémoire sur les Bollandistes par M. Gachard, in the Messager des Sciences et des arts de la Belgique. T. iii. (Gand. 1835), p. 200. On the history of the Bollandists, see what is written in the Bonn. Zeitschrift für Philos. u. kath. Theol. Heft. 17. S. 245 ff. Heft. 20. S. 235 ff.

[4] Literary collections relating to the fathers: Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclésiastiques, par L. Ellies du Pin. Paris, 1686—1714, gr. 8, with the continuations: Bibliothèque des Auteurs séparés de la Communion de l'Eglise Romaine, du 16 et 17 siècle par Ell. du Pin. Paris, 1718—19. 2 vols., and the Bibliothèque des Aut. Ecclés. du 18 siècle, par Claude Pierre Goujet. Paris, 1736—37. 3 vols. gr. 8. Comp. Remarques sur la Biblioth. de Mr. du Pin par Matthieu Petitdidier. Paris, 1691 ss. 3 Tom 8. and Critique de la Biblioth. de Mr. du Pin, par Rich. Simon. Paris, 1730. 4 Tom. 8.

Histoire des Auteurs Sacrés et Ecclésiastiques, par R. Ceillier. Paris, 1729 ff. 23 Thle. 4, (reaching to the thirteenth century). W. Cave, Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Historia Literaria. Oxon. 1740. Basil. 1741. 2 Voll. fol. (to the Reformation). Casp. Oudini Commentarius de Scriptoribus Ecclesiast. Antiquis. Lips. 1722. 3 voll. fol. (to the

ceeding from persons not Christians who came in contact with the professed disciples of the Saviour.

Among the *original documents* the following must be particularly examined: *the laws of different states*, as far as they have exerted an influence on the Christian church, or have themselves arisen under the influences of the church itself; *the acts and ordinances of ecclesiastical councils*;[5] *the official writings of the heads of churches, especially of the popes*;[6] *the rules*

year 1460). J. A. Möhler's Patrologie, herausgebeben v. Reithmayer. Bd. 1. Regensburg, 1840. J. Chr. F. Bähr die christl. römische Theologie. Carlsruhe, 1837, and his Gesch. de römischen Literatur im karolingischen Zeitalter, 1840, (a second and third supplementary volume, containing his History of Roman Literature.

J. A. Fabricii Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica. Hamb. 1718. fol. Ejusd. Biblioth. Latina mediæ et infimæ Ætatis. Hamb. 1734—46. 6 vols. 8. (enlarged by Mansi. Patav. 1754. 3 vols. 4), also Fabricii Biblioth. Græca, (Hamb. 1705 ss. voll. xiv. 4., ed. nova variorum curis emendatior curante G. Ch. Harless. Hamb. 1790—1809. Vol. xii. 4, incomplete), and Biblioth. Latina, (ed. 4. Hamb. 1722. 3 Tomi. 8. auct. ed. J. A. Ernesti. Lips. 1773, 74, 3 Tom. 8), contain accounts of ecclesiastical authors. A Supplement to the last work is presented in C. T. G. Schoenemanni Biblioth. Hist. Literaria Patrum Latin. a Tertulliano usque ad Gregor. M. Tomi. ii. Lips. 1792? 94. 8.

Patres ecclesiæ are, in the opinion of Catholics, the orthodox ecclesiastical writers as far as the thirteenth century, (these, however, are not normal, for this reason, like the Doctores Ecclesiæ, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Gregory the Great, Thomas Aquinas, and Bonaventura). Protestants usually restrict the appellation to the first six centuries, as the purer period of the church. The works of the fathers not included in separate collections are found in the large collections, such as: Magna Bibliotheca vett. Patrum. Paris 1654. 17 Tomi. fol. Maxima Bibliotheca vett. Patrum. Lugdun. 1677, 27 Tomi. fol. Andr. Gallandii Biblioth. vett. Patrum. Venetiis 1765 ss. 14 Tomi. fol.

[5] Chr. W. F. Walch Entwurf einer Vollständigen Geschichte der Kirchenversammlungen. Leipzig, 1759. 8. Saggittarianæ Introductionis in Histor. Eccl. Tom. ii. curante J. A. Schmidio, (Jenæ, 1718), p. 707.

Collections of the proceedings of general councils: Conciliorum omnium collectio Regia. Paris, 1644, 37 vols. fol. Sacrosancta Concilia—stud. Ph. Labbei et Gab. Cossarti. Paris, 1672, 18 vols. fol., (with a supplementary volume by Baluzius. Paris, 1683.) Conciliorum collectio Regia maxima stud. J. Harduini. Paris. 1715. 12 vols. fol. Sacrosancta Concilia—curante Nicol. Coleti. Venet. 1728 ss. 23 vols. fol., (with the supplementum, by J. Dom. Mansi. Lucæ, 1748, 6 vols. fol.) Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio. Cur. J. D. Mansi. Florent. et Venet. 1759 ss. 31 vols. fol., extending to 1509.

[6] Bullarium Romanum.—Luxemb. 1727. 19 vols. fol. Bullarium amplissima collectio op. Car. Coquelines, from the seventh volume onward,

of monastic orders;[7] *confessions of faith, liturgies, &c.*[8] *Monuments* are *ecclesiastical buildings, monuments of the dead, stone inscriptions,* and other works which art has produced in the service of the church.

§ 5.

USE OF THE SOURCES.

The inquiries of ecclesiastical history are directed to the facts belonging to the history of the church of external and internal life both in their manifestation and grounds, which are sought to be deduced directly from the sources, in their original connection. For this purpose the historian requires not only a penetrating and unbiassed *interpretation* of the sources which present themselves, but also *historical criticism,* to enable him to judge of the *genuineness, integrity,* and *credibility* of the sources, not only in general, but in each particular case.[1] This criticism must be the more watchful, since distortions of historical truth frequently appear in the province of ecclesiastical history, produced by the embarrassments of party views and interest, by the desire to adapt it to certain ends, and even by falsehood. In those cases in which the sources afford nothing at all, or what is false, relative either to single facts or their original connection, the inquirer must have recourse to *historical conjectures,* whose probability may border very nearly on truth, but often, perhaps, may rise very little above other possibilities. In forming such historical conjectures, he must be guided by a

with the title, Bullarium Romanum s. novissima collectio Apostolicarum Constitutionum. Romæ, 1739 ss. 14 Tomi in 28 Partt. fol., with the continuation, Bullarium Magnum Romanum Summorum Pontificum Clementis XIII. et XIV., Pii VI. et VII., Leonis XII., et Pii VIII. Romæ, 1833 ss. 89 fasc. fol.

[7] Lucæ Holstenii Codex Regularum Monasticarum. (Rom. 1661. 3 voll. 4.), auctus a Mar. Brockie. Aug. Vind. 1759. 6 voll. fol.

[8] J. A. Assemani Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiæ Universæ. Rom. 1749. 13 vols. 4. L. A. Muratorii Liturgia Romana vetus. Venet. 1748. 2 voll. fol. Eus. Renaudot Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio. Paris, 1716. 2 vols. 4.

[1] Ernesti de fide historica recte æstimanda, (in his Opusculis Philologico-Criticis, ed. 2. Lugd. Bat. 1776, p. 64, ss.) Griesbachii Diss. de fide hist. ex ipsa rerum quæ narrantur natura judicanda, (in his Opusc. Acad. ed Gabler. Jenæ, 1824, vol. i., p. 167, ss.)

careful consideration of existing relations, of the character of the period and persons, by analogy, and even by the false accounts of sources. The ecclesiastical historian must renounce party interest as well as prejudice in considering the peculiarities of his time. On the contrary, he cannot penetrate into the internal character of the phenomena of church history without a Christian religious spirit, because one cannot generally comprehend aright any strange spiritual phenomenon without reproducing it in himself. It is only investigation of this nature that can discover where the Christian spirit is entirely wanting, where it is used merely as a mask, another spirit having occupied its place. Wherever it exists it will not be mistaken, although it should manifest itself in such ways as are foreign to the spirit of our own times.

§ 6.

ARRANGEMENT OF THE MATERIALS OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.—HISTORIC REPRESENTATION.

The old methods of arranging the materials of ecclesiastical history according to years, or of dividing them into centuries, have been rightly abandoned. The division into *periods*, by means of *epochs*, has been generally adopted, although great difference prevails in fixing these periods. We assume four periods: *the first*, To the time of Constantine, the first development of the church under external oppression; *the second*, Till the beginning of the image controversies, the development of Christianity as the prevailing religion of the state; *the third*, Till the Reformation, the development of the Papacy prevailing over the state; *the fourth*, The development of Protestantism.[1] The contents of each period may be arranged either chronologically or according to an artificial space taken from the different

[1] The following have been used as epochs by different ecclesiastical historians, for the purpose of limiting their periods:—The destruction of Jerusalem, 70; Commencement of Constantine's reign, 306, or the Council of Nice, 325; Gregory the Great, 604, or Muhammed, 622; Boniface, the Apostle of the Germans, 715, or the beginning of the image-controversy, 725; Charlemagne, 800; Gregory VII., 1073; Removal of the papal residence to Avignon, 1305; Reformation, 1517; Founding of the University of Halle, 1693.

relations of the church. (§ 2.) Both methods used exclusively have their advantages and disadvantages. In the chronological arrangement things similar are often too widely separated, and the lines of development are torn asunder. In the other arrangement, when the periods are large, the mutual influence which the development of separate ecclesiastical relations has on each other at different times is obscured, and the survey of the entire condition of one particular time is rendered difficult. We must therefore endeavour, as far as possible, to unite the advantages of both methods, and to avoid their disadvantages. Although every period has its definite ecclesiastical character, yet this character undergoes many modifications during the lapse of the whole period. Hence the division of periods into small sections of time is justified. The materials of these smaller sections are best arranged chronologically, as long as the church in its first beginnings has not yet formed its internal relations; afterwards they may be disposed according to a division taken from these internal relations. In every section of time there prevails the development of one or of several ecclesiastical relations, so that they are of peculiar assistance in the development of other relations. It is therefore suitable to dispose the history of the different relations in the church in every minor period, according to their relative importance, and their influence on the whole.

The mode of writing ecclesiastical history must be worthy of the subject. The phenomena make a continual demand upon our moral and religious feelings. Where moral greatness is manifested, they excite our admiration; where they bear witness to errors, they excite our compassion; where they evince immoral designs and motives, they stir up our indignation; but they never furnish a fit subject for ridicule.

§ 7.

VALUE OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.[1]

Church history has a universal interest for men, as it forms

[1] J. J. Griesbach De Historiae Ecclesiasticae nostri seculi usibus sapienter accommodatae utilitate. Jen. 1776. 4. (in his Opusc. Acad. ed. Gabler. vol. i. p. 318.) Respecting the influence of the study of church

the most important part of the religious history of humanity. For the Christian it has a peculiar interest, since it discloses to him the later transformations of Christianity with their causes and effects, and guides him to a safe judgment with regard to what is original and essential in it. On this account, it is indispensable to the Christian theologian who desires to acquire a scientific knowledge of Christianity.[2] It is also of importance to the scholar, because of its essential connection with the history of learning, philosophy, morals, and arts. It is obvious, that a fundamental acquaintance with ecclesiastical law, and the legislative enactments of Christian states, is impossible without it.[3]

history on the culture of the mind, and the life, see three Vorlesungen von Dr F. A. Koethe. Leipzig, 1810, 4.

[2] J. A. Ernesti De Theologiæ historicæ et dogmaticæ conjungendæ necessitate et modo universo, (in his Opuscc. Theoll. p. 565.) Niemeyer's Abhandl. über die hohe Wichtigkeit u. die zweckmässige Methode eines fortgesetzten Studiums der Religions—u. Kirchengeschichte für prakt. Religionslehrer (prefixed to Fuhrmann's Handwörterbuch der Christl. Religions—und Kirchengesch. Bd. 1. Halle, 1826, 8.)

[3] J. H. Boehmer Diss. de necessitate et utilitate Stud. Hist. Ecclesiast. in juris ecclesiastici prudentia (in the Observatt. sell. ad Pet. de Marca libr. de concordia sacerdotii et imperii. Francof. 1708, fol.)

FIRST PERIOD.

TO THE SOLE REIGN OF CONSTANTINE, BY WHICH THE RECOGNITION OF THE CHURCH WAS SECURED IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE. FROM THE YEAR 1—324.

SOURCES.

I. The Scriptures of the New Testament.

II. Ecclesiastical historians. Fragments of Hegesippus (about 170 A.D.) ὑπομνήματα τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πράξεων (with a commentary in *Routh reliq. sacr.*, vol. i. p. 187 ss.)

Eusebius (bishop of Cæsarea † about 340) ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία in ten books,[1] ed. H. Valesius. Par. 1659 fol. (an incorrect reprint, Mogunt. 1672), ed. ii. 1677 (reprinted Amsterdam, 1695, fol.) Convenient smaller editions by F. A. Stroth. Hal. 1779. Tom. i. 8. E. Zimmermann. PP. II. Francof. ad M. 1822. 8. cum Valesii commentario aliorumque observationibus edidit, suas animadversiones, excursus et indices adjecit F. A. Heinichen. T. iii. Lips. 1827. 28. 8. ad codd. Mss. rec. Ed. Burton. Oxon. 1838. T. ii. 8. The Latin version of Eusebius's Church History, by Rufinus (about A.D. 400), in nine books (the tenth was not translated by him), with its continuation in two books (*Rufini hist. eccl. libb.* xi.), which was very common in the fifteenth and

[1] With regard to the credibility of Eusebius, which has been too much depreciated by Scaliger, Baronius, Masch (Abh. v. d. Grundsprache d. Evangel. Matth. Halle, 1755. S. 191), Gibbon and Semler (Novae Observatt., p. 17, and often,) see J. Moeller de fide Eusebii Caesar. Hafniae, 1813. 8. (reprinted in Stäudlin's and Tzschirner's Archiv. f. Kirchengesch. Bd. 3. St. 1.) J. T. L. Dans de Eusebio Caes. ejusque fide hist. recte aestimanda. P. i. Jenae, 1815. 8. Ch. A. Kestner Comm. de Eusebii auctoritate et fide diplomatica. Goetting., 1817. 4. H. Reuterdahl de Fontibus Hist. Eccles. Eusebianae. Londini Gothor., 1826. 8. Bern. Rienstra de Fontibus, ex quibus hist. eccl. opus hausit Eusebius Pamph. et de ratione, qua iis usus est. Traj. ad Rhen., 1833. 8. Dr C. R. Jachmann's remarks on the Church History of Eusebius, in Illgen's Zeitschrift für die histor. Theol. ix., ii., 10.

sixteenth centuries, but of which there is no edition since that of *Petr. Thom. Cacciari. Romae* 1740—41. Tomi ii., 4to, which was founded on critical principles, is frequently a work upon Eusebius rather than a translation. Still it is not unimportant in the criticism of the original (comp. E. J. Kimmelii de Rufino Eusebii interprete libb., ii. Gerae 1838. 8.) With the history of Eusebius are connected, even in the editions of Valesius and Zimmermann, his *εἰς τὸν βίον τοῦ μακαρίου Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ βασιλέως λόγοι δ'*,[2] ed. F. A. Heinichen. Lips. 1830. 8.

III. All the Christian writers of this period. The fragments of those whose works have been lost are collected in: J. E. Grabe spicilegium SS. Patrum ut et haereticorum saeculi i. ii. et iii. Tom. i. s. Saec. i. ed. 2. Oxon. 1700. Saec. ii. t. i. 1700. 8. (A new edition in 3 Tom. Oxon. 1714.) M. Jos. Routh reliquiae sacrae, sive auctorum fere jam perditorum secundi tertiique saeculi fragmenta, quae supersunt. Oxonii 1814—18. 4 Voll. 8.

IV. Acts of the martyrs. Theod. Ruinart acta primorum Martyrum sincera et selecta. Edit. 2. Amstelod., 1713. fol. (ed. Bern. Galura. August. Vindel., 1802. 3. P. iii. 8.) [Fox's Book of Martyrs.]

V. Certain passages of writers not Christian, namely, Josephus, Suetonius, Tacitus, Plinius the younger, Scriptores historiae Augustae, Dio Cassius, and others, are collected in: Nath. Lardner collection of the Jewish and Heathen testimonies of the Christ. relig. Lond., 1764—67. 4 Voll. 4.

WORKS.

Sebastien le Nain de Tillemont Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire Ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles, justifiés par les citations des auteurs originaux. Paris, 1693—1712. 16

[2] The doubts that were raised against the genuineness of these books by Jac. Gothofredus (Diss. ad Philostorg. Hist. Eccl., lib. vii. c. 3) and Chr. Sandius (de Scriptt. Eccl., p. 92) have been refuted by J. A. Bosii. exercit. posterior de Pontificatu max. Imp. Rom. C. 8. § 5. M. Hankius de Byzantin. rerum scriptoribus graecis. § 174. Balth. Bebelii Antiquitt. Eccl. t. i., p. 213. In regard to the historical character of this work even Socrates (hist. eccl. i. c. 1) designates Eusebius as *τῶν ἐπαίνων τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τῆς πανηγυρικῆς ὑψηγορίας τῶν λόγων μᾶλλον ὡς ἐν ἐγκωμίῳ φροντίσας, ἢ περὶ τοῦ ἀκριβῶς περιλαβεῖν τὰ γενόμενα.*

Thle. 4, reaches to 513. [Tillemont's Ecclesiastical Memoirs of the first six centuries, translated from the French. 2 vols. fol. Lond., 1733.] Joh. Laur. Moshemii commentarii de Rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum Magn. Helmst., 1753. 4. [Three volumes of this work have been translated by Vidal.] Joh. Sal. Semleri commentarius hist. de antiquo Christ. statu. Halae, 1771. 72. T. 2. 8. Ejusd. Observatt. novae, quibus Historia Christianorum studiosius illustratur usque ad Const. M. Halae, 1784. 8.

On the spread and persecution of Christianity:

[Gibbon's decline and fall of the Roman empire.] Ed. Gibbon die Ausbreit. des Christenthums aus natürl. Ursachen, übers. v. A. F. v. Walterstern. Hamb., 1788. 8. J. B. Lüderwald Ausbreitung der Christl. Religion. Helmst. 1788. 8. J. Andreä Entwickel. der natürl. Ursachen, welche die schnelle Ausbreit. des Christenth. beförderten. Helmst. 1792. 8.

Chr. Kortholt de Persecutionibus Eccl. primaevae. Kiloni, 1689. 4. C. W. F. Walch de Persecutionibus Christian. non solum politicis sed etiam religiosis. (Nov. Comment. Soc. Goett. T. ii.) J. G. F. Papst de ipsorum Christianorum culpa in vexationibus motis a Romanis. 3 Progr. Erlangen, 1789. 90. 4. C. D. A. Martini Persecutiones Christianorum sub Impp. Romanis, causae earum et effectus. Rostochii, 1802, 1803. Comm. iii.

FIRST DIVISION.

TO THE TIME OF HADRIAN. FROM 1—117.

Joh. Laur. Moshemii Institutiones Historiae Christianae Majores, Saec. I. Helmst., 1739. 4. J. S. Semler's neue Versuche die Kirchenhistor. des ersten Jahrhunderts aufzuklären. Leipzig, 1788. 8. (J. A. Starck's Geschichte der christlichen Kirche des ersten Jahrhunderts. Berlin and Leipzig, 1779—80. 3 Bde. 8.

INTRODUCTION.

OF THE CONDITION OF THE WORLD, ESPECIALLY ITS RELIGIOUS AND MORAL STATE, AT THE TIME OF CHRIST'S BIRTH, AND DURING THE FIRST CENTURY.

I.

CONDITION OF THE HEATHEN NATIONS.

C. I. Nitzsch üb. den Religionsbegriff der Alten, in the theol. Studien und Kritiken, Bd. 1. S. 527 ff. 725 ff. F. V. Reinhard's Versuch über den Plan, den der Stifter der christl. Religion zum Besten der Menschhei tentwarf. Wittenberg, 1781. 4te Aufl., 1798. 8. [Translated into English, and published at Andover, 1831, 12mo.] A. Tholuck über das Wesen und den sittlichen Einfluss des Heidenthums, besonders unter den Griechen u. Römern, mit Hinsicht auf das Christenthum (in A. Neander's Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Geschichte des Christenthums und des christlichen Lebens. Bd. 1. Berlin, 1823. [Translated in the American Biblical Repository for 1832, by Professor Emerson.] Neander's Kirchengesch. I, I, 7 ff. Especially: Der Fall des Heidenthums von Dr. H. G. Tzschirner, herausg. v. M. C. W. Niedner. Bd. 1. (Leipzig, 1829) S. 13 ff. [Leland's Advantage and Necessity of the Christian Revelation.]

§ 8.

The Roman empire, in the first century, extended not only over the whole civilized world, but almost over the known world. Beyond it little was known besides the Germanic tribes in the north, and the Parthians in the east. In the western half of that great empire, the language and customs of the Romans had become prevalent; but in the eastern, Greek cultivation as-

serted the superiority it had obtained since Alexander's conquests, and under the emperors penetrated more and more even into Rome.[1] It is obvious, how much the union of so many nations under one government, and the general diffusion of the Greek language, must have favoured the principles of Christianity.

§ 9.

OF THE RELIGIOUS AND MORAL CHARACTER OF THE ANCIENT NATIONS IN GENERAL.

Polytheism cannot, from its very nature, be favourable to morality. Its deities can only be finite beings, and resembling man, because it separates the divinity into many parts. Every nation gives expression to its character, its virtues, and its vices, in the deities it worships; and therefore the divinity, so disfigured, cannot lead men to a higher moral elevation. The heathen stand only in an external relation to their gods; and their entire religion is consequently nothing more than an external worship, which leaves untouched not only theological speculation, as long as it does not attack existing forms, but also moral sentiment. Human deities will be worshipped, propitiated, and reconciled, in the way of men; and for this purpose moral improvement is not needed so much as a kind of prudence. They cannot inspire respect and love, but fear only. Their worship is nothing more than a barter, in which man expects mercy, protection, and greater gifts, in exchange for demonstrations of respect, and offerings. This general character of polytheism is found in all heathen religions at the time of Christ. A mythology partly immoral, sanctified many vices by the example of the gods. The

[1] Cicero pro Archia, c. 10: Graeca leguntur in omnibus fere gentibus, Latina suis finibus, exiguis sane, continentur. How the Greek had incorporated itself with the language of conversation among cultivated Romans, may be seen in Cicero's Letters to Atticus, and in Augustus's letters in Suetonius, &c., Claudius c. 4. comp. Ovidii ars amandi ii., 121. Dial. de oratoribus c. 29. Juvenal. Satyr, iii., 58. xv., 110, vi., 185 ss. speaking of the Roman ladies:—

> Nam quid rancidius, quam quod se non putat ulla
> Formosam, nisi quae de Tusca Graecula facta est?
> Hoc sermone pavent, hoc iram, gaudia, curas,
> Hoc cuncta effundunt animi secreta.

worship of several deities consisted in immoral deeds. Thus, the worship of *Bel* in Babylon, of *Amun* in Thebes, of *Aphrodite* in Cyprus, Corinth, and many other places, elevated lewdness to the position of a religious service;[1] and the worship of other deities excited, at least, sensuality in a high degree.[2] In like manner, human sacrifices were customary, in several places, as yearly expiations; but everywhere, on occasion of extraordinary threatening dangers, for the purpose of propitiating the enraged deities.[3] Religious motives existed only to promote the exercise of the duties belonging to citizens;[4] and whatever of a higher nature appears in the case of individual Greeks and Romans, was owing, not to the religion of the people, but to their better moral nature.[5] In general, the feeling of man's dignity and rights was wanting, while in place of it was found nothing but a partial national conceit, joined to a profound contempt for every thing foreign, and propped up by religion, since every nation had but the expression of its own nationality in its deities. Hence the horrible treatment of man as a slave.[6] When the national pride was humbled by subjugation and oppression, the people readily lost along with it every noble feeling of self-respect, and sank into slavish abjectness. Woman lost among the Greeks the re-

[1] Clemens Alex. Cohort. ad Gentes, cap. 2. Arnobii Disputatt. adv. Gentes, lib. v. Tholuck as above. S. 171 ff.

[2] Tholuck as above. S. 143 ff.

[3] Tholuck S. 221 ff. Octavian caused 300 men to be slaughtered on the altar of Caesar (Sueton. Oct. c. 15. Dio Cassius 48, 14). Sextus Pompeius ordered that persons should be thrown into the sea as a sacrifice to Neptune (Dio Cassius, 48, 48). According to Porphyry, de abstin. carnis ii. c. 56, human sacrifices ceased to be offered in different nations at the time of Hadrian; but even in his day (about 280 A.D.) a human victim was yearly offered to Jupiter Latialis in Rome. Lactantius (about 300) Divin. Institt., i. c. 21: Latialis Jupiter etiam nunc sanguine colitur humano. Comp. Lipsius de Amphith., c. 4. (Opp. iii., 1003.) van Dale de Oraculis Gentilium, p. 442. Lamb. Bos, Heidenreich, Pott ad 1 Cor. 4, 13.

[4] Cicero de Legibus, ii. c. 7: Utiles esse autem opiniones has, quis neget, cum intelligat, quam multa firmentur jurejurando; quantae salutis sint foederum religiones; quam multos divini supplicii metus a scelere revocarit; quamque sancta sit societas civium inter ipsos, diis immortalibus interpositis tum judicibus, tum testibus.

[5] As Cicero, de fin. ii. c. 25, judges of Epicurus and his philosophy.

[6] Tholuck S. 197 ff. Gladiators. As late as the time of Claudius, that emperor was obliged to forbid the exposing or putting to death sick slaves. Sueton. in Claud., c. 25.

spect due to her, because of her political insignificance, since *public* virtue was deemed of the highest importance with that people.[7] Among eastern nations, polygamy had the same effect to a much greater extent.

§ 10.

RELIGION AND MORALS OF THE GREEKS.

Histoire de la civilisation morale et religieuse des Grecs par P. van Limburg Brouwer. Tom. 8. Groeningen, 1833—43, 8vo.

The Greek deities were ideal Greeks, whose sentiments and conduct were Grecian. By their will and example they exhorted to those virtues to which the Grecian character was disposed, or which were found necessary for the state and for social life. But so far were they from imaging forth a pure morality, or from exhibiting the national vices of the Greeks,[1] that the mythology, even as it was recognised by the philosophers, was able, for the most part, to influence morality only in the way of injury.[2] After the subjugation of Greece, when national honour, love of country, and patriotism, had ceased to be powerful motives, we find Greece in the condition of the deepest moral degradation.

[7] Tholuck S. 203 ff.

[1] In opposition to Tholuck, in the work already quoted, who traces the corruption of religion and morality to Grecian art, see Fr. Jacobs über die Erziehung der Hellenen zur Sittlichkeit, in his vermischte Schriften, Th. 3. An intermediate course is taken by Dr C. Grüneisen über das Sittliche der bildenden Kunst bei den Griechen, in Illgen's Zeitschrift f. d. hist. Theologie. iii., ii., 1. But another aspect must not be overlooked. Though it be possible that so much elevation and dignity as is represented by some was reflected in the divine forms, yet they necessarily referred the beholder to their mythology, and the impression that so much immorality could be united with such external excellence must have been highly corrupting to the morals. Cf. Augustinus de civ. Dei. iv., 31: Varro dicit etiam, antiquos Romanos plus quam annos centum et septuaginta deos sine simulacro coluisse. Quod si adhuc, inquit, mansisset, castius dii observarentur. Cujus sententiae suae testem adhibet inter caetera etiam gentem Judaeam, nec dubitat eum locum ita concludere, ut dicat, qui primi simulacra deorum populis posuerunt, eos civitatibus suis et metum dempsisse, et errorem addidisse.

[2] Plato (de repub. ii.) wishes to banish the immoral mythology from his republic; Aristotle (Politic, vii. 8) proposes that the young at least should be excluded from witnessing immoral rites.

Religion became with the people scarcely anything but an enjoyment of art, wanting too often in all that partakes of a moral spirit. Hence it was unable to elevate the deteriorated nation above their external state. How much the cultivation of the intellect and taste was preferred to morality, even in the flourishing times of Greece, is proved by the general estimation in which clever courtesans were held; while the rest of the female sex were, for the most part, neglected, as far as their spiritual culture was concerned.[3] The love of boys, which was so general, and inspired so many poets, shows how art ministered even to unnatural vices. *The mysteries* were far from presenting a better esoteric religion than that of the people.[4] They offered nothing but a secret mythology which attached itself to the popular religion,—a secret ritual to be practised in worshipping the gods,—directions for the purification of the initiated, accompanied, it is true, by several moral precepts, but all for the purpose of making the deities peculiarly propitious to the initiated.

§ 11.

RELIGION AND MORALS OF THE ROMANS TO THE TIME OF AUGUSTUS.

Ch. D. Beck über den Einfluss der röm. Religion auf die Charakter des Volks und des Staats (prefixed to his translation of Ferguson's History of the Roman Republic, Bd. 3, Abth. 2, S. 5, ff.) Du polytheisme romain. Ouvrage posthume par Benj. Constant. Paris, 1833. Die religion der Roemer aus den Quellen dargestellt von J. A. Hartung, 2 Theile. Erlangen 1836. 8vo.

The religion of the Romans was of a more grave and moral character, although in it the Grecian element was mixed up with the Etrurian. We find the ancient Romans distinguished not only for their political but their domestic virtues, and for a chastity rarely found in the bosom of heathenism. As long as

[3] Compare the circumscribing discussions of Fr. Jacobs (Beiträge zur Gesch. d. weibl. Geschlechts in Griechenland: 1. allgem. Ansicht der Ehe; 2. die hellen. Frauen; 3. von. den Hetären), Vermischte Schriften. Thl. 3. S. 157.

[4] As Warburton (the divine legation of Moses. Lond., 1742. Translated into German by J. Chr. Schmidt. Frankf. u. Leipz., 1751. 3 Bde.), Thl. 1. Bd. 2., and many after him assume. On the other side see especially Chr. Aug. Lobeck Aglaophamus s. de theologiae mysticae Graecorum causis, libb. iii. t. i. Regiomontii Pruss., 1829. 8.

Grecian art was unknown at Rome, so long too did the Grecian mythology with its poisoning influence remain unknown;[1] but after the destruction of Carthage and Corinth, the national character generally, and the Roman religion along with it, underwent by degrees a great alteration for the worse.[2] The riches which flowed into the city, the knowledge of Asiatic luxuries, and the mode of instruction followed by Greek masters, led to licentiousness and excesses; while the Grecian mythology, incorporated with Grecian art, was diffused by the poets, and entirely extinguished the old Roman character with its rigid virtue.[3]

§ 12.

RELIGIOUS TOLERATION OF THE ROMANS.

It was an universal principle among the ancients, that the gods themselves had arranged the peculiar form of their worship in every country. Hence all polytheistic religions were tolerant towards each other, as long as every worship confined itself to its own people or country. This toleration was also observed by the Romans.[1] On the other hand, to introduce strange gods and modes of worship without the sanction of the state was tantamount to the introduction of a superstition prejudicial to the interests of the community.[2] When, therefore, after the extended conquests of the Romans, foreign modes of worship were more and more introduced into the city, partly

[1] Polyb. hist. vi. c. 54. Dionys. Halicarn. Antiquitt. Roman. ii. c. 67, 69. Hartung i., 244. J. A. Ambrosch Studien u. Andeutungen in Gebiete des altrömischen Bodens und Cultus. Heft i. (Breslau, 1839.) S. 63.

[2] Hartung i., 249. Ambrosch, S. 69.

[3] Compare Terentii Eunuch., Act iii., Scen. 5, v. 35. Ovid. Tristium ii., v. 287 ss. Martialis, lib. xi., Epigr. 44. Seneca de brevit. vitae., c. 16: Quid aliud est vitia nostra incendere, quam auctores illis inscribere deos, et dare morbo, exemplo divinitatis, excusatam licentiam? Compare de vita beata, c. 26. C. Meiner's Gesch. des Verfalls der Sitten und der Staatsverfassung der Römer. Leipz., 1782. 8.

[1] Hartung i., 231. Dr K. Hoeck's röm. Geschichte vom Verfalle d. Republik bis zur Vollendung der Monarchie unter Constantin. (Braunschweig, 1842 ff.) Bd. 1. Abth. 2. S. 216 u. 371.

[2] Cicero de leg. ii., c. 8: Separatim nemo habessit deos; neve novos, sed ne advenas, nisi publice adscitos, privatim colunto.

lessening, by that means, attachment to the national religion, and partly promoting even immoral practices, the laws against the *sacra peregrina* were frequently renewed.[3] Religious societies of foreign origin could not easily hold out against such prohibitions, since they fell, besides, under the cognizance of the laws respecting *collegia*,[4] and were in direct opposition to them,[5]

[3] Compare, in particular, the extirpation of the Bacchanalian rites in the year 185 B.C. Livius xxxix., c. 8 ss., and the Senatusconsultum de tollendis Bacchanalibus, in the treatise about to be quoted of Bynkershoek. Valerius Maximus i. 3. de peregrina religione rejecta. Cf. Corn. van Bynkershoek de cultu religionis peregrinae apud veteres Romanos (in ejusd. opp. omn. ed. Ph. Vicat. Colon. Allobr., 1761. fol. Tom. i., p. 343 ss). Chr. G. F. Walch de Romanorum in tolerandis diversis religionibus disciplina publica (in novis commentariis Soc. Reg. Scient. Goettingensis. Tom. iii., 1773). De Burigny mémoire sur le respect, que les Romains avoient pour la religion, dans lequel on examine, jusqu'à quel degré de licence la tolérance étoit portée à Rome. (Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscript. T. 34. hist., p. 418 ss.) Hartung i., 232.

[4] Collegia, sodalitia, sodalitates, ἑταιρεῖαι. The Greeks and Romans were fond of such connections, which had their basis partly in relationship (comp. the Roman gentes and curiae, the Athenian φρατρίαι), partly in similarity of profession (so the collegia tibicinum, aurificum, architectorum, &c., at Rome). They had both their own sacred rites and a common fund, secret meetings and feasts (ἔρανοι). Thus the priests of the same deities not only formed collegia of this natûre (comp. sodales Augustales, Aureliani, &c.), but unions for the worship of certain deities were also reckoned collegia (for example, for the solemnisation of the rites of Bacchus, see note 3). So Cato says in Cicero de senectut., c. 13: Sodalitates me quaestore constitutae sunt sacris Idaeis Magnae Matris acceptis. So speaks Philo in Flaccum of the ἑταιρείαις καὶ συνόδοις in Alexandria, αἳ ἀεὶ προφάσει θυσιῶν εἱστιῶντο τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐμπαροινοῦσαι. Cf. Salmassii observatt. ad jus Rom. et Atticum., c. 3 u. 4. J. G. Stuckii antiquitatum convivialium, lib. i., c. 31. (Opp. tom. i., Lugd. Bat. et Amstel., 1695. fol., p. 173 ss.) H. E. Dirksen histor. Bemerkungen über den Zustand der juristischen Personen nach röm. Recht, in his civilist. Abhandlungen (Berlin, 1820). Bd. 1. S. 1 ff.

[5] Besides the prohibitions in the time of the Republic, compare that of Julius Caesar (Sueton. Caesar, c. 42), Augustus (Sueton. Octavian., c. 32), &c. Compare the later jurists in the Pandects: Gajus (about 160), lib. iii. (Digest. lib. iii., tit. 4, l. 1): Neque societas, neque collegium, neque hujusmodi corpus passim omnibus habere conceditur: nam et legibus et Senatusconsultis, et Principalibus constitutionibus ea res coërcetur, &c. Particularly Dig., lib. xlvii., Tit. 22, de collegiis et corporibus illicitis., Lex i. (Marcianus about 222): Mandatis Principalibus praecipitur Praesidibus Provinciarum, ne patiantur esse collegia sodalitia. § 1. Sed religionis causa coire non prohibentur: dum tamen per hoc non fiat contra Senatusconsultum, quo illicita collegia arcentur. Lex 2. (Ulpianus † 228): Quisquis illicitum collegium usurpaverit, ea poena tenetur,

and since all nocturnal associations were forbidden under pain of death.[6] On the other hand, the private worship of strange gods was not so easily eradicated.

§ 13.

RELATION OF PHILOSOPHY TO THE POPULAR RELIGIONS.

As soon as philosophy was cultivated in Greece, the unity of God was expressed in most of the schools,[1] while morality was placed on a more becoming and a religious foundation.[2] But while philosophy could not fail of producing a high religious feeling in the narrow circle of the initiated, it occasioned a crude scepticism among the more numerous class of the half instructed. Although Plato and Aristotle directly expressed their sentiments regarding the popular religion in a reserved and cautious manner, and even conformed externally to its requirements,[3] yet their theology afforded a standard by which, when many parts of the popular faith were judged, they must necessarily vanish into nothing. *The Stoic pantheism* endeavoured to preserve the current mythology by considering the deities as the fundamen-

qua tenentur, qui hominibus armatis loca publica vel templa occupasse judicati sunt (consequently according to Dig. xlviii., tit. 4, l. 1, like those convicted of high treason). Lex 3. (Marcianus), § 1: In summa autem, nisi ex Senatusconsulti auctoritate, vel Caesaris, collegium, vel quodcunque tale corpus coïerit, contra Senatusconsultum, et Mandata, et Constitutiones collegium celebratur. Cf. Jac. Cujacii Observationum, lib. vii., Observ. 30. Barn. Brissonii antiquitatum ex jure civili selectarum., lib. i., c. 14.

[6] Tab. ix., lex 6: Sei quei endo urbe coitus nocturnos agitasit, capital estod. This determination was renewed by the lex Gabinia (Leges xii., Tabularum restitutae et illustratae a J. N. Funccio. Rintelii, 1744. 4., p. 400).

[1] Cf. Cicero de nat. Deorum. i., c. 10 ss. Rad. Cudworthi systema intellectuale, vertit et illustr. J. L. Moshemius. (Jenae, 1733. fol.) p. 730 ss. [Ralph Cudworth's Intellectual System of the Universe. London, folio, 1678.] Chr. Meiners hist. doctrinae de vero Deo. Lemgov., 1780. P. ii.

[2] Stäudlin's Gesch. der Moralphilosophie, Hannover, 1822, in many passages. Limburg Brouwer's work already quoted in § 10.

[3] F. A. Carus hist. antiquior sententiarum Ecclesiae graecae de accommodatione Christo imprimis et Apostolis tributa, diss. Lips., 1793. 4., p. 13 ss. For the manner in which the Grecian states judged of every departure from the public religion, see F. W. Tittmann's Darstellung der griech. Staatsverfassungen. Leipz., 1822. S. 27 ff.

tal powers of the universe, and explaining the myths allegorically; but it destroyed, at the same time, all religious feeling by its spirit of pride.[4] The *Epicurean philosophy*, as far as it removed all connection between the gods and the world, making the latter originate in chance, destroyed all religion and morality; and though this was not its tendency in the eyes of the founder, it was certainly the aim of his later disciples. The scepticism of *the middle and new academy* exerted no better influence, at least in the larger circles.

Soon after Greek literature had been introduced at Rome after the time of *Livius Andronicus* (about 260 B.C.), sceptical doubts manifested themselves there also.[5] Subsequently, *the academy, the porch*, and *epicureanism*, finding a more general reception, from the time of the famous Athenian embassy, (Carneades, Diogenes, Critolaus, 155 B.C.), the flourishing philosophy tended not only to weaken the popular religion,[6] but to destroy the religious faith of many.[7] But although scepti-

[4] For example, Seneca epist. 73: Jupiter quo antecedit virum bonum? diutius bonus est. Sapiens nihilo se minoris aestimat, quod virtutes ejus spatio breviori clauduntur. Sapiens tam aequo animo omnia apud alios videt, contemnitque quam Jupiter: et hôc se magis suspicit, quod Jupiter uti illis non potest, sapiens non vult. Schwabe über das Verhältniss der stoischen Moral zum Christenthum, in the Zeitschrift für Moral, by C. F. Böhme and G. Ch. Müller, Bd. 1. St. 3. S. 38 ff. G. H. Klippel comm. exhibens doctrinae Stoicorum ethicae atque christianae expositionem et comparationem. Goetting., 1823. 8.

[5] They appeared first of all in Ennius (239—168 B.C.) Cf. Cicero de Nat. Deor. i., 42: Euhemerum noster et interpretatus et secutus est praeter caeteros Ennius. Ab Euhemero autem mortes et sepulturae demonstrantur deorum. Besides Ennius translated Epicharmus's representation of the Pythagorean doctrine respecting God, nature, and the soul; comp. Dr L. Krahner's Grundlinien zur Gesch. des Verfalls d. röm. Staatsreligion bis auf die Zeit des August (a school-programme). Halle, 1837. 4. S. 20 ff. Ennius's own religious views are given in Cic. de Divin. ii., c. 50:

> Ego Deum genus esse semper dixi, et dicam caelitum:
> Sed eos non curare opinor, quid agat humanum genus.

[6] Cic. de invent. i., 29: in eo autem, quod in opinione positum est, hujusmodi sunt probabilia:—eos, qui philosophiae dent operam, non arbitrari Deos esse. Idem pro Cluentio, c. 61. De nat. Deor. ii. c. 2. Tuscul. Quæst. i. c. 5, 6.

[7] In Sallustius in Catilina, c. 51, Cæsar says: in luctu atque miseriis mortem aerumnarum requiem, non cruciatum esse: eam cuncta mortalium mala dissolvere: ultra neque curae neque gaudio locum esse. And Cato says, in reference to Cæsar's speech, c. 52: Bene et composite C. Caesar paulo ante in hoc ordine de vita et morte disseruit; falsa, credo,

cism spread more and more, yet the unbelieving politicians and philosophers themselves agreed, that the native religion must be upheld with all their powers, as the support of the state, and of all the relations of life.[8] The religious motives which lay in the popular religion could supply no philosophy for the multitude;[9] and of foreign religious rites the opinion was, that they destroyed national feeling, and produced an inclination to foreign customs and laws.[10] Hence, even *Scaevola* (about 100 B.C.) wished to confirm anew the religion of the state by separating it from philosophy and mythology, whence proceeded its corruption;[11] and *M. Terentius Varro*, abiding by that separation, (about 50 B.C.), endeavoured to prepare for it a new basis out of the doctrine of the Stoics.[12]

existimans, quae de inferis memorantur: diverso itinere malos a bonis loca tetra, inculta, foeda atque formidolosa habere.

[8] Cicero de leg. ii., 7. See above § 9, note 4, de Divin. ii., 33: Non sumus ii nos augures, qui avium reliquorumve signorum observatione futura dicamus. Erravit enim multis in rebus antiquitas, quas vel usu jam, vel doctrina, vel vetustate immutatas videmus. Retinetur autem et ad opinionem vulgi, et ad magnas utilitates reipublicae mos, religio, disciplina, jus augurum, collegii auctoritas.

[9] Strabo in geograph. i., c. 2., pag. 19: Οὐ γὰρ ὄχλον τε γυναικῶν, καὶ παντὸς χυδαίου πλήθους ἐπαγαγεῖν λόγῳ δυνατὸν φιλοσόφῳ, καὶ προσκαλέσασθαι πρὸς εὐσέβειαν, καὶ ὁσιότητα καὶ πίστιν, ἀλλὰ δεῖ καὶ διὰ δεισιδαιμονίας· τοῦτο δ' οὐκ ἄνευ μυθοποιΐας, καὶ τερατείας.

[10] Comp. the advice of Maecenas to Augustus, according to Dio Cassius, lib. lii: τὸ μὲν θεῖον πάντη πάντως αὐτός τε σέβου κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τιμᾶν ἀνάγκαζε· τοὺς δὲ δὴ ξενίζοντάς τι περὶ αὐτὸ καὶ μίσει καὶ κόλαζε, μὴ μόνων τῶν θεῶν ἕνεκα, ὧν καταφρονήσας οὐδ' ἄλλου ἄν τινος προτιμήσειεν, ἀλλ' ὅτι καινά τινα δαιμόνια οἱ τοιοῦτοι ἀντεισφέροντες, πολλοὺς ἀναπείθουσιν ἀλλοτριονομεῖν· κἀκ τούτου καὶ συνωμοσίαι καὶ συστάσεις ἑταιρεῖαί τε γίγνονται, ἅπερ ἥκιστα μοναρχίᾳ συμφέρει· μήτ' οὖν ἀθέῳ τινί, μήτε γόητι συγχωρήσῃς εἶναι.

[11] Augustin. de civit. Dei iv., 27: Relatum est in literis, doctissimum pontificem Scaevolam disputasse tria genera tradita deorum; unum a poëtis, alterum a philosophis, tertium a principibus civitatis. Primum genus nugatorium dicit esse, quod multa de diis fingantur indigna: secundum non congruere civitatibus, quod habeat aliqua supervacua, aliqua etiam quae obsit populis nosse (namely, non esse deos Herculem, Aesculapium, &c.—eorum, qui sint dii, non habere civitates vera simulacra—verum Deum nec sexum habere, nec aetatem, nec definita corporis membra). Haec pontifex nosse populos non vult, nam falsa esse non putat. Comp. Krahner S. 45.

[12] According to Augustinus de civ. Dei vi., 2., Varro said in his Rerum Divinarum, lib. xvi., the second part of his Antiquitates: se timere, ne (dii) pereant, non incursu hostili, sed civium negligentia: de qua

§ 14.

REVOLUTION OF RELIGIOUS MODES OF THINKING UNDER THE EMPERORS.

C. Meiners Gesch. des Verfalls der Sitten, der Wissenchaften und Sprache der Römer in den ersten Jahrhunderten nach Christi Geburt. Wien u. Leipzig 179[illegible]. 8. S. 268 ff. P. E. Müller de hierarchia et studio vitae asceticae in sacris et mysteriis Graecorum Romanorumque latentibus. Hafn. 1803. 8. (translated in the Neuen Biblioth. der schönen Wissensch. Bd. 69 u. 70). To this topic belongs the first section, viz. Origin of the—superstition—till the time of Domitian.

In the reign of the emperors the national deities, who were

illos velut ruina liberari a se dicit, et in memoria bonorum per hujusmodi libros recondi atque servari. He also distinguishes (l. c. vi., 5) tria genera theologiae, namely, mythicon, quo maxime utuntur poëtae, physicon, quo philosophi, civile, quo populi. Primum, quod dixi, in eo sunt multa contra dignitatem et naturam immortalium ficta. Secundum genus est, quod demonstravi, de quo multos libros philosophi reliquerunt. In quibus est: dii qui sint, ubi, quod genus caet. (Augustine adds: Nihil in hoc genere culpavit. Removit tamen hoc genus a foro i. e. a populis: scholis vero et parietibus clausit. Illud autem primum mendacissimum atque turpissimum a civitatibus non removit.) Tertium genus est, quod in urbibus cives, maxime sacerdotes, nosse atque administrare debent. In quo est, quos deos publice colere, quae sacra et sacrificia facere quemquam par sit. Prima theologia maxime accommodata est ad theatrum, secunda ad mundum, tertia ad urbem. (Plutarch also, Amator, c. 18, and de placitis philosoph. i., 6, distinguishes this threefold theology, τὸ μυθικόν, τὸ φυσικόν and τὸ πολιτικόν.) Respecting the religion of the Roman state, Varro, as reported by Augustine, l. c. iv., 31: said, non se illa judicio suo sequi, quae civitatem Romanam instituisse commemorat; ut, si eam civitatem novam constitueret, ex naturae potius formula deos nominaque deorum se fuisse dedicaturum non dubitet confiteri. Sed jam quoniam in vetere populo essent accepta, ab antiquis nominum et cognominum historiam tenere ut tradita est debere se dicit, et ad eum finem illam scribere ac perscrutari, ut potius eos magis colere, quam despicere vulgus velit. L. c. vii., 6: Dicit ergo idem Varro adhuc de naturali theologia praeloquens, Deum se arbitrari esse animam mundi, quem Graeci vocant κόσμον, et hunc ipsum mundum esse Deum. Hic videtur quoquo modo confiteri unum Deum, sed ut plures etiam introducat, adjungit, mundum dividi in duas partes, caelum et terram; et caelum bifariam in aethera et aëra, terram vero in aquam et humum. Quas omnes quatuor partes animarum esse plenas, in aethere et aëre immortalium, in aqua et terra mortalium: a summo autem circuitu caeli usque ad circulum lunae aethereas animas esse astra ac stellas, eosque caelestes deos non modo intelligi esse, sed etiam videri. Inter lunae-

obliged to divide their honours with the most miserable of men,[1] sank by degrees still lower in the faith of the people.[2] The attachment to traditional customs and institutions, decaying along with liberty, could no longer afford these gods a protection. Politics and habit secured them nothing more than a lukewarm, external worship.[3] The relations of the times did not lead men away from the error that had been committed, towards a somewhat purer religion, but to a still grosser superstition. The cowardly weaklings, which were the offspring of a luxury surpassing all bounds,[4] must have stood open to every superstition, especially as dangers daily threatened them from those in power. Curiosity, and an inordinate longing for the secret and the awful, con-

vero gyrum et nimborum ac ventorum cacumina aëreas esse animas, sed eas animo, non oculis videri, et vocari heroas, et lares, et genios. Haec est videlicet breviter in ista praelocutione proposita theologia naturalis, quae non huic tantum, sed et multis philosophis placuit. Tertullian's second book, ad Nationes, is directed against this theology of Varro. Comp. Hartung i., 274. Krahner, S. 49.

[1] According to Polybius, 5, the custom of honouring benefactors with sacrifices and altars appeared first among the Asiatics, the Greeks, and Syrians. Similar honours were frequently paid to proconsuls in their provinces. (Cicero ad Atticum v., 21. Sueton. Oct., c. 52. Mongault in the Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscr., T. i., p. 353 ss.) Cæsar caused these honours to be decreed to him by the senate in Rome also. (Suet. Caes. 76.) Augustus accepted in the provinces temples and colleges of priests (Tacit. Annal i., 10. Suet. Oct., c. 52); and so did all his successors, with the single exception of Vespasian. Domitian even began his letters with: Dominus et Deus noster hoc fieri jubet (Suet. Domit. 13). J. D. Schoepflini comm. de apotheosi s. consecratione Impp. Romanorum (in Ejusd. commentt. hist. et. crit. Basil., 1741. 4., p. 1 ss).

[2] Senecae Ep. 24. Juvenal. Satyr. ii., v. 149:

Esse aliquos manes, et subterranea regna
Et contum, et stygio ranas in gurgite nigras,
Atque una transire vadum tot millia cymba,
Nec pueri credunt, nisi qui nondum aere lavantur.

[3] Seneca de superstitionibus apud Augustin. de civit. Dei vi., c. 10: Quae omnia sapiens servabit tanquam legibus jussa, non tanquam Diis grata. Omnem istam ignobilem Deorum turbam, quam longo aevo longa superstitio congessit, sic adorabimus, ut meminerimus, cultum ejus magis ad morem quam ad rem pertinere.

[4] Juven. Sat. vi., 292—300:

Nunc patimur longae pacis mala. Saevior armis
Luxuria incubuit, victumque ulciscitur orbem.
Nullum crimen abest, facinusque libidinis, ex quo
Paupertas Romana perit: hinc fluxit ad istos
Et Sybaris colles, hinc et Rhodos et Miletos,
Atque coronatum et petulans madidumque Tarentum.
Prima peregrinos obscoena pecunia mores
Intulit, et turpi fregerunt secula luxu
Divitiae molles. Comp. Meiners l. c. S. 95.

tributed to increase the superstition. To this must be added the decline of the earnest study of the sciences (law and juridical eloquence being almost the only studies of the time); but, above all, the excessive corruption of the age.[5] Cowardly vice sought partly to make magical rites subservient to its will,[6] while it was, in part, driven to more powerful purifications by the stings of conscience. Already had the religions of the east, by their mysterious, fantastic worship, and the asceticism of their priests, made an impression on the superstitious disposition of the Romans, so that they had been restricted and opposed by the laws. But the current of the time that set in now broke through all laws. Foreign modes of worship and priests found their way into the state with a power that could not be repressed. In addition to them, a great number of astrologers (mathematici), who pretended to be initiated into the secret sciences of the east, interpreters of dreams, and magicians, spread themselves through the empire.[7] The object of such persons was to turn

[5] Compare especially the satires of Persius and Juvenal. Seneca de ira ii., 8: Omnia sceleribus ac vitiis plena sunt: plus committitur, quam quod possit coërcitione sanari. Certatur ingenti quodam nequitiae certamine: major quotidie peccandi cupiditas, minor verecundia est. Expulso melioris aequiorisque respectu, quocunque visum est, libido se impingit. Nec furtiva jam scelera sunt: praeter oculos eunt: adeoque in publicum missa nequitia est, et in omnium pectoribus evaluit, ut innocentia non rara, sed nulla sit. Numquid enim singuli aut pauci rupere legem? undique, velut signo dato, ad fas nefasque miscendum coorti sunt.

—— Non hospes ab hospite tutus,
Non socer a genero. Fratrum quoque gratia rara est.
Imminet exitio vir conjugis, illa mariti.
Lurida terribiles miscent aconita novercae.
Filius ante diem patrios inquirit in annos.

(from Ovid. Metam. i., v. 144 ss.) Et quota pars ista scelerum est! &c. Comp. ejusd. Epist. 95. Pauli epist. ad Rom. i., 21 ss. Comp. Corn. Adami de malis Romanorum ante praedicationem Evangelii moribus (in his Exercitationes exegeticae. Groening., 1712. 4., the fifth exercit.) Meiners a. a. O. Schlosser's universalhist. Uebersicht der Gesch. der alten Welt. iii., i., 122 ff. 326 ff. Hoeck's röm. Gesch. vom Verfall der Republik bis zur Vollendung der Monarchie unter Constantin. i. ii., 301 ff.

[6] Diodorus Sic. bibl. hist. xx., c. 43, p. 755: Δεισιδαίμονες γὰρ οἱ μέλλοντες ἐγχειρεῖν ταῖς παρανόμοις καὶ μεγάλαις πράξεσι.

[7] Of foreign deities Serapis and Isis (43 B.C.) were the first who had a temple in the city. The fruits of superstition were shared among the priests of Isis, who was particularly reverenced, the Galli, the priests of Dea Syra, the Magi, Chaldai (s. Genethliaci, qui de motu deque positu stellarum dicere posse, quae futura sunt, profitentur, Gellius Noct. Att.

the prevailing superstition as much as possible to their own advantage, and at the same time to strengthen it. The laws of the first emperors against foreign customs were of less avail, because they themselves believed in their efficacy, followed them in private, and were only afraid that they should be abused to the prejudice of their own persons.[8]

This superstition was promoted in no slight degree by philosophy making it subservient to its purpose.[9] The more boldly philosophical scepticism had attacked not only the popular religions, but also the general truths of religion, so much the more zealously did the later philosophy endeavour to put together systems framed in part from earlier ones, and in part from the materials themselves of the popular religion. In these newly-invented systems every superstition found shelter. Under Augustus, the long-forgotten doctrines of Pythagoras were suddenly

xiv., 1, where a copious refutation of these arts may be found), Mathematici (genus hominum potentibus infidum, sperantibus fallax, quod in civitate nostra et vetabitur semper, et retinebitur. Tacit. hist. i., 22), and even the vagrant Jews. Comp. Diet. Tiedemann disputat. de quaestione, quae fuerit artium magicarum origo, &c., Marburg. 1787. 4. p. 56 ss. Hoeck i., ii., 378. How much the female sex, in particular, was given to this superstition is strikingly described by Juvenal Sat. vi., 510—555. Cf. Strabo vii., c. 3, § 4: "Απαντες τῆς δεισιδαιμονίας ἀρχηγοὺς οἴονται τὰς γυναῖκας. αὗται δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας παρακαλοῦνται πρὸς τὰς ἐπίπλεον θεραπείας τῶν θεῶν, καὶ ἑορτὰς καὶ ποτνιασμούς· σπάνιον δέ, εἴ τις ἀνὴρ καθ' αὑτὸν ζῶν εὑρίσκεται τοιοῦτος. On the superstition of this period generally, see Plinii nat. hist. ii., c. 5: Vix prope est judicare, utrum magis conducat generi humano, quando aliis nullus est Deorum respectus, aliis pudendus. Externis famulantur sacris, ac digitis Deos gestant: monstra quoque, quae colunt, damnant et excogitant cibos, imperia dira in ipsos, ne somno quidem quieto, irrogant. Non matrimonia, non liberos, non denique quidquam aliud nisi juvantibus sacris deligunt. Alii in Capitolio fallunt, ac fulminantem pejerant Jovem: et hos juvant scelera, illos sacra sua poenis agunt.

Meiners l. c. S. 276 ff. The example of the elder Pliny shows how unbelief and superstition united in the educated class. He says, nat. hist. ii. c. 5: Irridendum vero, agere curam rerum humanarum illud quicquid est summum. Anne tam tristi atque multiplici ministerio non pollui credamus dubitemusve? vii. c. 56: Omnibus a suprema die eadem, quae ante primum: nec magis a morte sensus ullus aut corpori aut animae, quam ante natalem. He speaks, however, in his Second Book in a very believing tone respecting portenta, ex. gr., cap. 86: Nunquam urbs Roma tremuit, ut non futuri eventus alicujus id praenuntium esset. Comp. Tacit. ann. vi., c. 22.

[8] Tzschirner Fall des Heidenthums. Bd. 1. S. 127 ff.

revived in the most wonderful form by *Anaxilaus*, who was soon followed by the still more adventurous *Apollonius of Tyana*.[10] While these men endeavoured to restore, out of their own resources, the Pythagorean philosophy, as if it had proceeded from the mysteries of Egyptian priests, and looked upon Platonism as an efflux of the doctrine of Pythagoras, a singular, heterogeneous philosophy of religion grew up under their hands, in which all popular religions, no less than all magic arts, found their justification. From this time onward even the Platonic school forsook the scepticism of the new academy, attaching itself to those modern Pythagoreans, though it sought to assimilate its dogmatism to other systems also, particularly the Aristotelian. The mode of life among the Pythagoreans was not attractive to many,

[10] Apollonius lived from 3 B.C. till 96 A.D. Celsus does not name him among the wonder-workers (Aristeas, Abaris, &c.), whom he compares with Christ (Origen against Celsus iii.) In the second century Lucian (in Alexander) and Apuleius (Apologia, Opp. ed. Elmenhorst, p. 331) describe him as a famous magician. In the same light did he also appear to his oldest biographer, Möragenes, who speaks besides of his influence with the philosophers (Origenes c. Cels. vi. ed. Spencer, p. 302), so that he appears to have given a philosophical basis to magic. From the beginning of the third century, when a religious interest gathered around him, the memory of Apollonius became prominent. Caracalla dedicated a sanctuary to him (Dio Cassius lxxvii. 18); Severus Alexander set him up in his collection of household gods (Aelius Lamprid. in vita Sev. Al. c. 29). Julia Mammaea, in particular, was a great admirer of him. Into her hands came the memorabilia of Damis, a companion of Apollonius, which Philostratus the elder, in his life of Apollonius (Philostratorum opera gr. et lat. ed. G. Olearius. Lips. 1709. fol.), wished to bring into a more acceptable form (vita Ap. i., 3) by using a work of Maximus of Aege. Here Apollonius appears as a wise man and a favourite of the gods, furnished with wonderful powers in working miracles, and commissioned by the gods themselves to reform the popular religions. On the other hand, the older representation of Möragenes is designated as almost useless. Dio Cassius, however, continually enumerates Apollonius among the magicians and impostors. That the work of Damis is spurious, and originated probably in the third century, may be proved not only from the absurdity of the contents, but also from anachronisms (Prideaux's connection, Hug's Introduction to the N. T.) Cf. Mosheim de existimatione Apollonii Tyanaei (in his Commentationes et orationes varii argumenti ed. J. P. Miller. Hamburgi, 1751. 8. p. 347), de scriptis A. T. (l. c. p. 453). de imaginibus telesticis A. T. (l. c. p. 465). Apollonius v. Tyana u. Christus, od. d. Verhältnits d. Pythagoreismus zum Christenthum von Dr Baur (in the Tübingen Zeitschr. f. Theol. 1832. Heft. 4., also printed separately).

and consequently this *new Platonism* formed the prevailing philosophy. With it, as the philosophy of superstition,[11] *Epicureanism* almost alone, as the philosophy of unbelief,[12] divided the dominion over the minds of men generally. Of the pure *Peripatetics* there was always but a small number; and though *the Stoics* could boast of so distinguished men at this time (*Seneca, Dio of Prusa, Epictetus*), yet their system of morality excited admiration, instead of exerting an influence on the life.[13] The Cynics had lowered themselves so much by their shamelessness that their influence on the age was of little consequence.

II.

CONDITION OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE.

Sources—Writings of the New Testament. Flavii Josephi (born 37 n. Chr. † about 93) Opera (Antiquitatum Judaicarum libb. xx —de bello Judaico libb. vii.—de vita sua—contra Apionem libb. ii.) ed. Sigeb. Havercamp. Amstel, 1726. 2 Bde. fol. Smaller editions by Franc. Oberthür. Wirceburgi 1782—85. 3 Thle. 8. and C. E. Richter. Lips. 1826 s. 6 voll. 8.

J. M. Jost Geschichte der Israeliten seit der Zeit der Maccabäer bis auf unsere Tage. Berlin 1820—28. 9 Thle. 8.

§ 15.

IN PALESTINE.

After the Babylonish captivity the Jews were successively

[11] These Platonists also exercised the profession of astrology. So Thrasybulus, the soothsayer of Tiberius (Sueton. in Tib. c. 14. 62. Tac. ann. vi., 20).

[12] See above note 8. Juvenal. Satyr. xiii., 86 ss.

> Sunt, in fortunae qui casibus omnia ponant,
> Et nullo credant mundum rectore moveri,
> Natura volvente vices et lucis et anni;
> Atque ideo intrepidi quaecunque altaria tangunt.

[13] Cicero Orat. pro Murena, c. 30: arripuit—disputandi causa—magna pars. Respecting the customs of the philosophers of this time generally compare in Seneca, epist. 29, the reason why he doubts of gaining over a wit Marcellinus to philosophy: Scrutabitur scholas nostras, et objiciet philosophis congiaria, amicas, gulam: ostendet mihi alium in adulterio, alium in popina, alium in aula. Hos mihi circulatores, qui philosophiam honestius neglexissent, quam vendunt, in faciem ingeret. Juvenal. Sat. ii. init.

subject to the Persians, Egyptians, and Syrians, and then formed (from 167–63 B.C.) an independent state under the Maccabees, till the last of that race, *Hyrcanus*, was obliged to acknowledge the Roman sovereignty. After his death, *Herod*, the Idumean, (from 40–4 B.C.) ruled over the land in dependence on the Romans, and afterwards divided it among his three sons, so that *Archelaus* was ethnarch of Judea, Idumea, and Samaria, while *Philip* and *Herod Antipas*, as tetrarchs, received possession,—the former, of Batanea, Ituræa, and Trachonitis,—the latter, of Galilea and Peræa. After the banishment of *Archelaus*, (6 A.D.), his territories became a Roman province, and were governed under the proconsul of Syria, by a procurator, (the fifth *Pontius Pilate* from 28–37 A.D.) The tetrarchy of *Philip* did not continue long after his death in the hands of the Romans, but was consigned to *Herod Agrippa* (37), who united with it the tetrarchy (39) of the banished *Herod Agrippa*, and was finally elevated by Claudius even to be king of all Palestine (41). After his death, his entire kingdom again became a Roman province, managed by procurators, *(Cuspius Fadus, Tiberius, Alexander, Ventidius Cumanus, Claudius Felix, Porcius Festus, Albinus, Gessius Florus)*. His son, Agrippa II., afterwards obtained the kingdom of Chalcis, (47), which he was soon obliged to change for the tetrarchy of Philip (52); whilst, at the same time, the superintendence of the temple at Jerusalem was entrusted to him as a Jew. With him the race of Herod became extinct († 100 at Rome).[1]

Oppression under a foreign yoke, and especially the persecution of religion by Antiochus Epiphanes, had produced among the Jews a strict separation from all that was unjewish, inflaming their contempt and hatred for all foreign customs, and, at the same time, raising to a high degree their national feelings and attachment to the religion of their fathers. But, alas! a spiritual feeling for religion had expired with the spirit of prophecy. The priesthood, finding no longer any opposing obstacle, connected, with one-sided aim, the renovated zeal of the people with the external law, and, in particular, with the Levitical wor-

[1] Christ. Noldii hist. Idumea s. de vita et gestis Herodum. Franeq. 1660. 12., also in Havercamp's edition of Josephus, t. ii. Appendix, p. 331 ff. E. Bertheau's zur Gesch. der Israeliten zwei Abhandlungen. Göttingen, 1842. S. 437.

ship which was always enlarging itself, in which alone the priests, as such, had an interest. Even *the synagogues* that arose after the Babylonish captivity,[2] adapted as they were to promote a more spiritual religion, served still more to advance the legal spirit of the Levitical code. Hence, there arose at this time the most obstinate attachment—yea, a fanatical zeal for the Mosaic ceremonial, apart from any real religious feeling and moral improvement, and accompanied rather by a more general and deeper corruption of the people.[3] Amid this disposition, which was directed only to the external, their pride in transmitted privileges, and in the peculiar favour of Jehovah, increased equally with the hope that God would soon free his favourite people from the yoke of the heathen, and under the dominion of Messiah elevate them to be the rulers of the earth. These earthly expectations and views, which the people painted to themselves in a highly sensuous degree, must have been very prejudicial to the inward religious feelings.[4] At the same time, the opinion was not rare, that it was unworthy of the people of God to obey a foreign power.[5] On the other hand, the prejudices and national pride of a people despised by the

[2] Cf. Camp. Vitringa de Synagoga vetere, libb. iii. Franeker, 1696. ed. 2. Leucopetr., 1726. 4.

[3] Comp. Josephus in several passages; for example de B. J. v., 10, 5, he declares: *μήτε πόλιν ἄλλην τοιαῦτα πεπονθέναι, μήτε γενεὰν ἐξ αἰῶνος γεγονέναι κακίας γονιμωτέραν.* Ibid. v., 13, 6. Ibid. vii., 8, 1: *ἐγένετο γάρ πως ὁ χρόνος ἐκεῖνος παντοδαπῆς ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις πονηρίας πολυφόρος, ὡς μηδὲν κακίας ἔργον ἄπρακτον καταλιπεῖν, μηδ' εἴ τις ἐπινοίᾳ διαπλάττειν ἐθελήσειεν ἔχειν ἄν τι καινότερον ἐξευρεῖν. οὕτως ἰδίᾳ τε καὶ κοινῇ πάντες ἐνόσησαν, καὶ πρὸς ὑπερβαλεῖν ἀλλήλους ἔν τε ταῖς πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀσεβείαις, καὶ ταῖς εἰς τοὺς πλησίον ἀδικίαις ἐφιλονείκησαν.*

[4] Respecting the Judaism of this time, see De Wette's biblische Dogmatik (2te Aufl. Berlin, 1818), § 76 ff. Baumgarten-Crusius Grundzüge der bibl. Theologie. Jena, 1828, S. 117 ff. C. H. L. Poelitz dissert. de gravissimis theologiae seriorum Judaeorum decretis. Lips., 1794. 4. The same author's pragmatische Uebersicht der Theologie der spätern Juden. Leipz., 1795. Th. 1. 8. A. F. Gfrörer's das Jahrhundert des Heils. 2 Abth. Stuttgart, 1838. On the ideas entertained of the Messiah: Bertholdt christologia Judaeorum Jesu Apostolorumque aetate. Erlang., 1811. 8. C. A. Th. Keil historia dogmatis de regno Messiae Christi et Apostolorum aetate. Lips., 1781 (in Keilii opusculis, ed. J. D. Goldhorn. Lips., 1821. Sect. i., p. 22 ss.) Bertholdt and Gfrörer have ventured to throw too much of the later Rabbinism backward into this period.

[5] Judas Galilaeus and his adherents, *μόνον ἡγεμόνα καὶ δεσπότην τὸν θεὸν ὑπειληφότες* (Jos. Ant. xviii., 1, 6). *Ἰούδας εἰς ἀπόστασιν ἐνῆγε τοὺς*

Romans, infused hatred into the minds of the procurators and other Roman officials, which was often exhibited in provocations and oppressions. Hence arose frequent rebellions against the Roman power, till at last the general insurrection under *Gessius Florus* (65) led to the devastation of the whole land, and the destruction of Jerusalem, (70). By this means the strength of the people was broken for a time, but their disposition and aims were not changed.

It remains for us to notice three sects of the Jews:[6] *the Pharisees,*[7] in whom the Judaism of that time, with the new doctrinal sentiments acquired in exile, and its own continued culture of the Levitical law, presented itself in a completed form. All the traits of the national character were presented by this sect in a still more cultivated degree, and hence it was the greatest favourite among the people. *The Sadducees*[8] endeavoured to give prominence to the old Hebraism which appears in the written law of Moses. *The Essenes* led an ascetic life in retirement,[9] and exerted but little influence over the people.

ἐπιχωρίους, καχίζων, εἰ φόρον τε Ῥωμαίοις τελεῖν ὑπομένουσι, καὶ μετὰ τὸν θεὸν οἵσουσι θνητοὺς δεσπότας (de B. J. ii., 8, 1). cf. Deut. xvii. 15.

[6] Trium scriptorum illustrium (Drusii, Jos. Scaligeri, et Serarii) de tribus Judaeorum sectis syntagma, ed Jac. Triglandius. Delphis, 1703. 2 voll. 4. De Wette's hebräisch-jüdische Archäologie. § 274. 275. Peter Beer's Geschichte, Lehren und Meinungen aller bestandenen und noch bestehenden religiösen Secten der Juden, und der Geheimlehre oder Cabbalah. Brünn, 1822. 23. 2 Bde. 8.

[7] Winer's bibl. Realwörterbuch, ii. 289.

[8] Chr. G. L. Grossmann de philosophia Sadducaeorum, Part iv. Lips., 1836—38. 4., is of opinion that, although Philo does not name the Sadducees, there are many references to them in his works, whereas the parties whom Philo combats are to be looked for in Alexandria (comp. Schreiter in Keil's u. Tzschirner's Analecten i., 1, u. ii., 1). Comp. Winer ii., 415.

[9] Respecting them see Philo quod omnis probus sit liber, Josephus in several places, Plinius nat. hist. v. 15. J. J. Bellermann's geschichtl. Nachrichten aus dem Alterthume über Essäer u. Therapeuten. Berl., 1821. 8. Jos. Sauer de Essenis et Therapeutis disqu. Vratislav., 1829. 8. A. Gfrörer's Philo und die alexandrinische Theosophie. ii., 299. A. F. Dähne's geschichtl. Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandr. Religionsphilosophie i., 469. Neander's K. G. 2te Aufl. i., i., 73. According to Gfrörer, they were Therapeutae who had come into Palestine, and whose opinions were there modified. According to Baur (Apollonius of Tyana, p. 125), they were Jewish Pythagoreans. Dähne is of opinion that the Essenes had at least an Alexandrian basis for their sentiments. Neander, on the contrary, thinks that the peculiar tendency which charac-

§ 16.

SENTIMENTS OF THE HEATHEN NATIONS TOWARDS JUDAISM.

Judaism was respected by the heathen as an old popular religion; and Jehovah, as the God of the Jews, received, particularly from the different rulers of this country, the honours due to the deity of the land.[1] But the Jews did not respect the religions of other people in the same manner, inasmuch as they treated their deities as nonentities, avoided all intercourse with foreigners as unclean, and expected that their own only true God would one day triumph over all other nations.[2] Hence they were despised and hated, especially since antiquity was accustomed to estimate the power of the gods by the condition of

terised them had been formed independently of external circumstances out of the deeper religious meaning of the Old Testament, but that subsequently it received foreign, old-oriental, Parsic, and Chaldean, but not Alexandrian elements.

[1] Even Alexander is said to have offered sacrifice in the temple at Jerusalem according to the direction of the high priest (Joseph. Ant. xi., 8, 5). So also Ptolemy Euergetes (c. Apion. ii., 5). Seleucus Philopator (2 Macc. 3, 1—3) and Augustus (Philo de legat. ad Cajum., p. 1036) sent of their own revenues for the daily sacrifices. Vitellius sacrificed in Jerusalem (Jos. Ant. xviii., 5, 3). Tertullian Apolog., c. 26: cujus (Judaeae) et deum victimis, et templum donis, et gentem foederibus aliquando, o Romani, honorastis.

[2] Certainly the Jewish idea of the Messiah was known to the heathens in general, but we must not derive the measure of this knowledge from the passages: Sueton. Vespas., c. 4, percrebuerat Oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis, ut eo tempore Judaea profecti rerum potirentur. Tacit. hist. 5, 13. Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum literis contineri, eo ipso tempore fore, ut valesceret oriens, profectique Judaea rerum potirentur. Both these historians have here manifestly copied Josephus (de B. J. vi., 5, 4: ἦν χρησμὸς ἀμφίβολος ὁμοίως ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς εὑρημένος γράμμασιν, ὡς κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας τις αὐτῶν ἄρξει τῆς οἰκουμένης), as is proved not only by the similarity of the words and the common reference to Vespasian, but also the express mention of Josephus and his prophecy in Sueton. Vesp., c. 5. But Josephus, in this case, gave a Grecian expression to the Jewish notion of the Messiah, and the flattering application to Vespasian was made for the purpose of giving importance to the writer's nation and himself, and to remove suspicion from them for the present at least. Tacitus makes frequent use of Josephus in his history of the Jews, though he always takes a Roman point of view.

the people that served them.[3] They were most hated by the neighbouring nations, particularly the Egyptians. In the eyes of the proud Romans, they were rather an object of contempt.[4] We find, therefore, no attempt, under the dominion of the Romans, to extinguish this hated religion, such as that made by Antiochus Epiphanes, although, once and again, there seems to have been a design to make Roman customs universal in opposition to the national prejudices. This hatred and contempt produced singular stories respecting the origin and history of the Jews,[5] as well as absurd notions of their religion;[6] and these in their

[3] Cicero pro Flacco, c. 28. Sua cuique civitati religio, Laeli, est, nostra nobis. Stantibus Hierosolymis, pacatisque Judaeis, tamen istorum religio sacrorum a splendore hujus imperii, gravitate nominis nostri, majorum institutis abhorrebat: nunc vero hoc magis, quod illa gens, quid de imperio nostro sentiret, ostendit armis: quam cara diis immortalibus esset, docuit, quod est victa, quod elocata, quod servata. Apion ap. Joseph. contra Apionem ii., 11. Minucii Felicis Octavius, c. 10. The heathen Caecilius says, Judaeorum sola et misera gentilitas unum —Deum—coluerunt; cujus adeo nulla vis nec potestas est, ut sit Romanis numinibus cum sua sibi natione captivus.

[4] Of Apollonius Molon, a rhetorician of Rhodes, B.C. 70, Josephus says (c. Apion. ii. 14), *ποτὲ μὲν ὡς ἀθέους καὶ μισανθρώπους λοιδορεῖ, ποτὲ δ' αὖ δειλίαν ἡμῖν ὀνειδίζει καὶ τοὔμπαλιν ἔστιν ὅπου τόλμαν κατηγορεῖ καὶ ἀπονοίαν· λέγει δὲ καὶ ἀφυεστάτους εἶναι τῶν βαρβάρων.* Tacit. hist. v. 5, apud ipsos fides obstinata, misericordia in promptu, sed adversus omnes alios hostile odium, c. 8, despectissima pars servientium—teterrima gens. Diodor. Sic. xxxiv., p. 524. Philostratus in vita Apollonii v., c. 33. Juven. Sat. xiv., 103. According to Philo (in Flacc., p. 969), there remained among the Egyptians *παλαιὰ καὶ τρόπον τινὰ γεγεννημένη πρὸς Ἰουδαίους ἀπέχθεια.* Jos. c. Apion. i., 25. *τῶν δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς βλασφημιῶν ἤρξαντο Αἰγύπτιοι—αἰτίας δὲ πολλὰς ἔλαβον τοῦ μισεῖν καὶ φθονεῖν* caet.

[5] The oldest sources of these fables are the fragment of Hecataeus Milesius (doubtless Abderita), in Photius's bibl., cod. 154, and the more malignant representation of the Egyptian Manetho (about 280 B.C., ap. Joseph. c. Apion. i., 26, comp. 14). The saying was afterwards repeated with manifold remodellings by the Egyptian Chaeremon (at the time of Augustus, ap. Jos., l. c., c. 32), by Lysimachus (about 100 B.C., ibid. c. 34), Justin (hist. 36, 2), and Tacitus (hist. v., c. 2). Comp. J. G. Müller in the theol. Studien u. Kritiken, 1843, iv., 893. Josephus wrote his two books against Apion in refutation of these calumnies against his countrymen.

[6] Particularly concerning the object of their worship. Many, indeed, saw in Jehovah their Zeus or Jupiter: Varro ap. Augustin. de consensu evangel. i. 22. Aristeas de legis divinae interpr. historia, p. 3. *τὸν γὰρ πάντων ἐπόπτην καὶ κτίστην θεὸν οὗτοι σέβονται, ὃν καὶ πάντες, ἡμεῖς δὲ μάλιστα, προσονομάζοντες ἑτέρως Ζῆνα.* According to another opinion the

turn contributed to increase the contempt of which they were the offspring.

§ 17.

CONDITION OF THE JEWS OUT OF PALESTINE.

J. Remond Geschichte der Ausbreitung des Judenthums von Cyrus bis auf den gänzlichen Untergang des jüd. Staats. Leipz. 1789. 8. Jost's Gesch. d. Israeliten. Th. 2. S. 262.

The Jewish people were by no means confined to Palestine. Only the smaller part of them had availed themselves of the permission of Cyrus to return to their native land, and therefore numbers had remained behind in *Babylonia*, who, doubtless, spread themselves farther toward the east, so that in the first century they were very considerable, (οὐκ ὀλίγαι μυριάδες, *Jos. Ant.* xv. 3, 1). In Arabia, the kings of the *Homerites* (about 100 B.C.) had even adopted the Jewish religion, and subsequently it had reached the throne of *Adiabene*, by the conversion of king *Izates*, (about 45 A.D., comp. Jos. Ant. xx. 2). At the building of *Alexandria*, Alexander the Great brought a colony of Jews to settle there, (Jos. de B. I. ii. 36); more were brought by Ptolemy Lagi to *Egypt*, *Cyrene*, and *Lybia*, (Jos. Ant. xii. 2, 4); and the Jews were very numerous in these places, (1,000,000, Philo in Flacc. p. 971. In Alexandria two-fifths of the population, ibid. p. 973). By trade they soon became rich and powerful.[1] Many Jewish colonists had also been carried into *Syria* by Seleucus Nicanor, (Jos. Ant. xii. 3, 1), especially to *Antioch*, where, in after times, a great part of the population consisted of Jews, (Jos. de B. J. vii. 3, 3). Antiochus

Jews worshipped the heaven (Juvenal. Sat. xiv., 97, nil praeter nubes et coeli numen adorant). Others thought that they worshipped Bacchus (Plutarch Sympos. iv. Qu. 5, Tacit. hist. 5. 5). According to others, the object of adoration was an ass's head (Apion ap. Jos. c. Ap. ii., 7. Tacit. hist. 5, 4. Plut. l. c.) According to others, a swine (Plutarch. l. c. Petronius in fragm.: Judaeus, licet et Porcinum numen adoret, &c.) Comp. the fable of the Jews sacrificing every year a Greek, and eating of his flesh (Joseph. c. Apion. ii., 8). Jo. Jac. Huldrici gentilis obtrectator s. de calumniis gentilium in Judaeos et in primaevos Christianos. Tiguri, 1744. 8.

[1] C. E. Varges de statu Aegypti provinciae Romanae I. et II. p. Chr. n. saeculis. Gottingae 1842. 4. p. 18, 39, 46.

the Great was the first who sent a Jewish colony to *Phrygia* and *Lydia*, (Jos. l. c:), and from these two countries they had spread themselves not only over the whole of *Asia Minor*, but also over *Greece*. The first Jews in Rome had been brought as prisoners of war by Pompey. They afterwards obtained their freedom, (therefore they were styled *libertini*, Philo de legat. ad Caj., p. 1014, Tacit. ann. ii. 85), received permission from Julius Cæsar to erect synagogues, (Jos. Ant. xiv. 10, 8), and soon occupied the greatest part of the city beyond the Tiber, (Philo. l. c.). Thus, at the time of Christ, it was not easy to find a country in the whole Roman empire in which the Jews did not dwell, (Strabo, xiv. c. 2, Philo legat. ad caj. p. 1031).

All these widely dispersed Jews (ἡ διασπορά) considered Jerusalem as their common capital, the sanhedrim of that place as their ecclesiastical supreme court; and sent not only yearly contributions in money, (δίδραχμα), and offerings to the temple, (Philo de Monarch, lib. ii. p. 822, in Flacc. 971, legat. ad. Caj. 1014, 1023, 1031, Cicero pro Flacc. 12, Tacit. Hist. 5, 5), but also frequently repaired thither to the great festivals, (Philo de Monarch, lib. ii. p. 821), without detriment being done to this common sanctuary by the temple built in Leontopolis (152 B.C.) by Onias.[2] They obtained peculiar privileges not only in the places where they settled as colonists, at the desire of the princes of the country, but Cæsar had allowed them the free exercise of their religion,[3] in a series of regulations enacted for the purpose, while he granted them several favours in relation to their law.[4] But these very distinctions merely served to

[2] The temple of Onias was as far from causing a schism among the Jews as the dispute between the Pharisees and Sadducees, although the building of it was disapproved by the Palestinian Jews.

[3] By this, therefore, their synagogues were put into the class of collegia licita, (see above, § 12). Comp. the decree of the Praetors C. Julius ap. Joseph. Ant. XIV. 10, 8: Γάϊος Καῖσαρ, ὁ ἡμέτερος στρατηγὸς καὶ ὕπατος, ἐν τῷ διατάγματι κωλύων διάσους συνάγεσθαι κατὰ πόλιν, μόνους τούτους οὐκ ἐκώλυσεν οὔτε χρήματα συνεισφέρειν, οὔτε σύνδειπνα ποιεῖν. ὁμοίως δὲ κἀγὼ τοὺς ἄλλους διάσους κωλύων τούτους μόνους ἐπιτρέπω κατὰ τὰ πάτρια ἔθη καὶ νόμιμα συνάγεσθαί τε καὶ ἱστασθαι. So also Augustus, (Philo de legat. ad Cajum. p. 1035, 1036.)

[4] Comp. Jos. Ant. XIV. 10, 2 ff. Claudius, in his edict, gives briefly what was granted them, and what was required of them, (Jos. Ant. xix. 5, 3): Ἰουδαίους τοὺς ἐν παντὶ τῷ ὑφ' ἡμᾶς κόσμῳ τὰ πάτρια ἔθη ἀνεπικωλύτως φυλάσσειν,—καὶ μὴ τὰς τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν δεισιδαιμονίας ἐξουθενίζειν. Decreta Romana et Asiatica pro Judaeis ad cultum div.—secure obeun-

make them still more hated by their fellow-citizens, with whom, : therefore, they had frequent quarrels.

In the mean time, Judaism had been introduced in many ways among the heathen. It is true that only a few became complete converts to it by submitting to circumcision (proselytes of righteousness);[5] but several, particularly women,[6] attached themselves to it for the purpose of worshipping Jehovah as the one true God, without observing the Mosaic law, (proselytes of the gate),[7] which was sufficient for those who were not Jews, according to the opinion of the more liberal Jewish expositors.[8]

dum—restituta a Jac. Gronovio. Lugd. Bat. 1712. 8. Decreta Romanorum pro Judaeis e Josepho collecta a J. Tob. Krebs. Lips. 1768. 8. Dav. Henr. Levyssohn disp. de Judaeorum sub Caesaribus conditione et de legibus eos spectantibus. Lugd. Bat. 1828. 4.

[5] i.e., right, complete proselytes. Of such speaks Tacitus, hist. v. 5: Circumcidere genitalia instituere, ut diversitate noscantur. Transgressi in morem eorum idem usurpant, nec quidquam prius imbuuntur, quam contemnere deos, exuere patriam; parentes, liberos, fratres, vilia habere. Juvenal. Sat. XIV. 96 ff.?

> Quidam sortiti metuentem sabbata patrem,
> Nil praeter nubes, et caeli numen adorant:
> Nec distare putant humana carne suillam,
> Qua pater abstinuit, mox et praeputia ponunt.
> Romanas aut m soliti contemnere leges,
> Judaicum ediscunt, et servant, ac metuunt jus,
> Tradidit arcano quodcunque volumine Moses.

A list of existing proselytes is given by Causse in the Museum Hagnum I. 549.

[6] So almost all the women in Damascus, Joseph, de B. J. II. 20, 2; so was Fulvia in the time of Tiberius, at Rome, *νομίμοις προσεληλυθυῖα τοῖς Ἰουδαϊκοῖς*, Ant. XVIII. 3, 5. So were many Judaisers in Syria, de B. J. II. 18, 2, comp. the inscriptions in Hug Einl. in d. N. T. 3te Aufl. II. 339. Act. 13, 50, 17, 4. Comp. Strabo above, § 14, note 7.

[7] Such was the name originally given to those who were not Jews, but to whom permission was granted to dwell as sojourners in Palestine, under the condition of observing certain laws, (Levit. xvii. 8ff, בְּשַׁעֲרֶיךָ גֵּרְךָ אֲשֶׁר, Exod. xx. 10; Deut. v. 14). But now, under altered circumstances, all heathens who attached themselves to Judaism by the spontaneous observance of those precepts, received the same appellation. These precepts, which, in the opinion of the Jews, were delivered even to Noah, (comp. Genesis ix. 4 ff.), and in him to the whole human race, are said to be seven. 1. A prohibition of idolatry; 2. Blasphemy; 3. The shedding of human blood; 4. Incest; 5. Theft; 6. The command to practise righteousness; 7. To eat no blood, and no animal in which the blood still remains. See Seldenus de jure nat. et gent. lib. 1, c. 10. In the New Testament these proselytes are called *φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν, σεβόμενοι τ. θ.*

[8] The school of Hillel, to which Gamaliel, Paul's preceptor, belonged,

Others, on the contrary, especially in Rome, which longed after foreign rites, felt themselves attracted not so much by the religion as by the religious ceremonial of the Jews. These indivividuals observed Jewish ceremonies without separating themselves on that account from heathen forms of worship, kept Jewish festivals, and trusted in Jewish conjurations. There soon appeared, also, Jewish jugglers, who ministered to this heathen superstition as conjurors and soothsayers.[9]

allowed these proselytes a part in the kingdom of the Messiah; the school of Shammai excluded them from it,—both with reference to Ps. ix. 18. See E. M. Roeth epistolam vulgo ad Hebraeos inscriptam non ad Hebraeos sed ad Ephesios datam esse. Francof. ad M. 1836. 8. p. 117. 126 ss. At the conversion of king Izates, Ananias was of the milder, Eleazer of the stricter views, Joseph, Ant. xx. c. 2. The later rabbins follow the opinion of Hillel, as they do in all disputes between these two schools. Othonis lexicon rabbin, p. 243. Roeth, p. 129.

[9] On account of many impostors of this kind, Tiberius expelled the Jews from Rome, Jos. Ant. xviii.. 3, 5. The Jewish festivals were kept by the heathen, Horat. Sat. I. 9, 69:

> ——— hodie tricesima sabbata: vin' tu
> Curtis Judaeis oppedere? Nulla mihi, inquam,
> Religio est. At mi: sum paulo infirmior, unus
> Multorum;

The women in particular frequented them,

Cultaque Judaeo septima sacra Syro (Ovid. Art. Amat. I. 75). cf. Selden de jure nat. et gent. lib. iii., c. 15 ss. Gottl. Wernsdorf de gentilium sabbato. Viteb. 1722. 4. For examples of Jewish conjurors see Acts xix. 13. Joseph. Antiq. viii. 2, 5, (Eleazer, who before Vespasian gave proofs of exorcism). Plinii natur. hist. xxx. c. 2: Est et alia magices factio a Mose et Janne et Jotape Judaeis pendens. Celsus accused the Jews, (Orig. c. Cels. i. p. 21), αὐτοὺς σέβειν ἀγγέλους, καὶ γοητείᾳ προσκεῖσθαι, ἧς ὁ Μωϋσῆς αὐτοῖς γέγονεν ἐξηγητής. In regard to Jewish soothsayers see Juven. Sat. vi. 543:

> Arcanam Judaea tremens mendicat in aurem,
> Interpres legum Solymarum, et magna sacerdos
> Arboris, ac summi fida internuntia coeli:
> Implet et illa manum, sed parcius. Aere minuto
> Qualiacunque voles Judaei somnia vendunt.

In this way the Jewish names for deity came into the formulæ of heathen impostors, though at a later period; and were supposed to possess a peculiar magical power in union with the heathen appellations of God, (Origenes c. Cels. iv. p. 183, v. p. 262), and were found on gems; see my remarks in the Theol. Stud. u. Kritiken, 1830, Heft 2, p. 403. To this influence of Judaism Seneca refers, de superstitionibus (ap. Augustin. de civit. Dei, vi. 11): Cum interim usque eo sceleratissimae gentis consuetudo convaluit, ut per omnes jam terras, recepta sit, victi victoribus leges dederunt. Illi tamen causas ritus sui noverunt, sed major pars populi facit, quod cur faciat ignorat. It might be expected that with this heathen tendency many should make a mere external profes-

At the same time, intercourse with the pagans could not exist without exerting some influence on the Jews. It must have partly smoothed away many rough points of their national character, and have partly communicated to them a great portion of the cultivation of the nations among whom they lived. A philosophical mode of treating their religion was developed especially at *Alexandria*, under the Ptolemies, in consequence of the study of Grecian philosophy, and thence a peculiar philosophy of religion, which may be traced from *Aristobulus*, (about 160 B.C.), throughout *the Book of Wisdom*,[10] and *the Therapeutæ*,[11] to its most distinguished representative *Philo*, († 41 A.D.)[12] Though Philo's Platonic Judaism in this complete form

sion of Judaism. Hence we can explain why the Talmudists passed so severe a judgment on the Pharisees, although the latter were still very zealous in making proselytes at the time of Christ (Matth. xxiii. 15): Proselyti impediunt adventum Messiae, sunt sicut scabies Israeli &c. Othonis lexicon rabbin. p. 491. Wagenseilii Sota, p. 754.

[10] In regard to these traces see generally Gfrörer's Philo II. and Dähne's jüdisch-alex. Religionsphilosophie II.

[11] Philo de vita contemplativa. The writings of Bellermann and Sauer mentioned in § 15, note 9. Gfrörer ii. 280. Dähne i. 443. Later writers, by drawing unhistorical conclusions, have discovered Christian ascetics in the Therapeutae. So Eusebius hist. eccles. ii. 17, and all succeeding authors except Photius, cod. 104. The same opinion was held after the Reformation by most of the older historians of the catholic and episcopal English church, (see the writings on both sides in Triglandii syntagma, see above, § 15, note 6), even Bern. de Montfaucon, (not. ad Philon. de vit. contempl.), and L. A. Muratori, (anecdot. graec. p. 330). The dispute of the former, respecting this point, with Jo. Bouhier: lettres pour et contre sur la fameuse question, si les solitaires appellez Therapeutes étoient Chrétiens. Paris 1712. 8.—Even Philo is said to have been on friendly terms with Peter at Rome, under Claudius, (εἰς ὁμιλίαν ἐλθεῖν Πέτρῳ, Euseb. l. c. Hieron. catal. 11), from which afterwards arose the fable that he had embraced Christianity and afterwards forsook it, (Photius cod. 105). cf. Mangey praef. in Phil. Opp.

[12] Opp. ed. A. Turnebus, Paris 1552, in an improved edition by Dan. Hoeschelius. Col. Allobrog. 1613. Paris 1640. Francof. 1691. fol. (citations are usually made according to the pages of the last two editions, which coincide in this respect). Thom. Mangey. Lond. 1742. 2 Voll. fol. A manual edition by A. F. Pfeiffer. Erlang. 1785. 5 Voll. 8. incomplete. In late times Angelo Mai found in the Greek language the writings of Philo de festo cophini and de parentibus colendis, (Philo et Virgilii interpretes Mediol. 1818, 8vo); and J. B. Aucher published in Latin several treatises preserved in an Armenian version, (de providentia and de animalibus. Venet. 1822. fol. Philonis Jud. paralipomena Armena. ibid. 1826. fol.) All this has been taken into the latest manual

was only the property of a few, yet the general ideas contained in it were widely diffused among the Hellenic Jews at that time, and afterwards gained an important influence over the philosophy of religion which formed itself within the bosom of Christianity. This is especially the case with regard to the doctrine of Philo concerning *the Logos*, the God revealing himself in the finite, in whom the Mosaic creative word, and the Platonic ideal world, were united.[13]

§ 18.

THE SAMARITANS.

The mixed people[1] who had grown up into a society after the destruction of the kingdom of Israel, in the tract belonging to it, (2 Kings 17, 24 ff., כּוּתִים, Σαμαρεῖται), had constantly been an object of detestation to the Jews because of their religion, which had been at first compounded of Judaism and heathenism. The Samaritans, indeed, under the direction of the Jewish priest Manasseh supported by the Persian viceroy *Sanballat*, had retained the Pentateuch, (409 B.C.), erected a temple on

edition by E. Richter. Lips. 1828—30. 8 Tom. 8. Comp. F. Creuzer zur Kritik der Schriften des Juden Philo in the theol. Studien u. Krit. 1832. i. 1. Dähne's Bemerkungen über die Schriften des Philo. das. 1833, iv. 984.—Philo's Lehrbegriff von E. H. Stahl, (in Eichhorn's Bibl. d. bibl. Lit. iv. 5, 770). C. G. L. Grossmann quaestiones Philoneae. Lips. 1829. 4. A. Gfrörer's Philo u. die alexandrin. Theosophie. 2 Thle. Stuttgart 1831. 8. A. F. Dähne's geschichtl. Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrin. Religionsphilosophie. 2 Abthl. Halle 1834. 8.

[13] I cannot agree with the prevailing view, that the strictly mono theistic Philo thought of the Logos as hypostatically different from God. Since the infinite cannot be revealed in the finite, God was under the necessity, so to speak, of making himself finite for this purpose, i.e., of separating from his own infinite perfections a finite measure of ideas and powers. God, in this aspect, is the Logos. Accordingly, the Logos is less than God, the revealed God less than deity in himself, but not on that account a hypostasis different from God.

[1] In opposition to Hengstenberg, who (Beitr. zur Einleit. ins. A. T. ii. 1, 3) affirms, that the Samaritans were originally a heathen people who accommodated themselves by degrees to the Mosaic institution, see Dr Kalkar's treatise die Samaritaner ein Mischvolk, in Pelt's theolog. Mitarbeit. Jahrg. 3 Heft 3. (Kiel 1840) p. 24.—[Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature, art. *Samaritans*.]

Gerizim, established a levitical priesthood,—in short, the whole of Judaism as it then was;[2] but all served merely to increase the hatred of the Jews against them, although they were united from this time onward, not only by neighbourhood, but also by a similar religion, and a series of like fortunes. This hatred entertained by the Jews, which the Samaritans seemed not to have returned with like virulence, was not abated in their native land by the destruction of the temple on Gerizim by *John Hyrcanus*, (109 B.C.); it was transferred to Egypt where Jewish and Samaritan colonies had been planted by Alexander and Ptolemy Lagi,[3] and has continued to the latest times.

The Samaritans held fast by Judaism, as it had come to them by Manasseh, with rigid strictness; and therefore the later developments of it among the Jews remained unknown to them, as they did also to the Sadducees.[4] Besides, in the history of this people there was no ground for the same degree of national arrogance and hatred of every thing foreign as existed among

[2] Nehem. xiii. 28. Comp. Joseph. Ant. xi. 7, 2. 8, 2. 4. 6, who places incorrectly the defection of Manasseh under Darius Codomannus, instead of Darius Nothus. Prideaux hist. des Juifs. ii. 397. Jahn bibl. Archäologie. ii. 1, 278. G. Gesenius de pentateuchi Samaritani origine, indole et auctoritate. Halae 1815, 4.

[3] Samaritan warriors were transplanted into Thebais by Alexander (Joseph. Ant. xi. 8, 6), into Lower Egypt and Alexandria by Ptolemy Lagi, (Jos. l. c. xii. 1). A controversy between the Jews and Samaritans at Alexandria is related by Josephus, l. c. xiii. 3, 4.

[4] Concerning their doctrine see Philastrius de haer. cap. 7. Epiphanius de haer. 9. Leontius de sectis c. 8. Their pentateuch was printed along with the Samaritan translation in the Paris Polyglott 1629. A more accurate knowledge of their condition and doctrines in modern times has been obtained from the letters of the Samaritans to Jos. Scaliger 1589; to men at Oxford, through the medium of Robert Huntington 1671; to Job Ludolf 1784, (see these letters in Eichhorn's Repertorium ix. and xiii.); and to De Sacy, (since 1808), comp. Sylv. de Sacy mémoire sur l'état actuel des Samaritains. Paris 1812, (translated into German in Stäudlin's and Tzschirner's Archiv. for Kg. I. iii. 40). These were revised, and along with the recent letters containing two of 1820, republished by De Sacy in the Notices et Extraits des manuscrits de la Bibl. roy. T. xii. Paris 1829. In addition, a letter of 1700 was made known by Hamaker in the Archief voor kerkelijke Geschiedenis door Kist en Royaards, v. 1, (Leiden 1834).—Besides this, Samaritan poems exist, which belong to the times of the Arabs, and were first used in Gesenius de Samaritanorum theologia ex fontibus ineditis comm. (Weihnachtsprogramm, Halle 1822. 4), and subsequently published: Carmina Samaritana e codd. Londinensibus et Gothanis ed. et illustr. Guil. Gesenius. Lips. 1824. 8.

the Jews.[5] And while among the Jews the extravagant national feeling fostered a more sensuous apprehension, of the doctrine of a special Divine providence in favour of their nation, and of the Messiah, and by this means favoured a worldly view of the doctrines of religion; that smaller measure of national pride existing among the Samaritans was the cause of their looking at Judaism more in its spiritual aspect.[6] This tendency was certainly promoted by the connection of the Samaritans with those of the same faith who had settled in Alexandria, and who were then partakers of Grecian culture. Still, however, the

[5] Hence Josephus blames them, (Ant. xi. 8, 6): εἰσὶν οἱ Σαμαρεῖς τοιοῦτοι τὴν φύσιν, ἐν μὲν ταῖς συμφοραῖς ὄντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἀρνοῦνται συγγενεῖς ἔχειν, ὁμολογοῦντες τότε τὴν ἀλήθειαν. ὅταν δέ τι περὶ αὐτοὺς λαμπρὸν ἴδωσιν ἐκ τύχης, ἐξαίφνης ἐπιπηδῶσιν αὐτῶν τῇ κοινωνίᾳ, προσήκειν αὐτοῖς λέγοντες, καὶ ἐκ τῶν Ἰωσήπου γενεαλογοῦντες αὐτοὺς ἐκγόνων Ἐφραΐμου καὶ Μανασσοῦ. So, too, they are said to have professed themselves to Alexander, Ἑβραῖοι μὲν εἶναι, χρηματίζειν δ' οἱ ἐν Σικίμοις Σιδώνιοι (Joseph. l. c.), On the contrary, to Antiochus Epiphanes as ὄντες τὸ ἀνέκαθεν Σιδώνιοι. (Joseph. Ant. xii. 5, 5). In like manner, they are said to have escaped threatening danger under this king by calling their temple ἱερὸν Διὸς Ἑλληνίου, but without making any change in their worship, Joseph. l. c. cf. 2 Macc. 6, 2.

[6] In the later Samaritan writings a progressive development of several doctrines by the influence of the Alexandrian peculiarities cannot be mistaken. The characteristics of Samaritan theology are strict Monotheism, aversion to all Anthropomorphism (Gesenius de theol. Sam., p. 12 ss), both which were manifested even in their Pentateuch (Gesenius de pentat. Sam., p. 58 ss). According to Leontius de sectis, they denied the doctrine of angels, i.e. the improved Jewish doctrine regarding them. In the later poetical writings angels appear as uncreated influences proceeding from God חִילִין (חֵילִים δυνάμεις), comp. Gesenius de theol. Sam., p. 21, which resembles a gnostic development, of which the first trace appears to be in Acts 8, 10. They magnified Moses and the law, rejecting all the later prophetic writings. The Sabbath and circumcision were regarded as the most important pledges of the covenant with Jehovah. The temple on Gerizim was the only true one (Deuteron. xxvii. 4, עֵיבָל altered into גְּרִזִים. Gesen. de Pent. Sam., p. 61). According to the fathers, they denied immortality and the resurrection, i.e. they maintained the insensible state of the soul in Sheol. We find among them afterwards a resurrection to a life entirely different from the present (Gesenius de theol. Sam., p. 38). The Messiah (הַשָּׁהֵב or הַתָּהֵב Ges. l. c., p. 44: reductor, converter), probably à בֶּן יוֹסֵף, will lead the people to repentance, and then to happiness, the nations will believe in him, and by him will be won over to the law, and to the temple on Gerizim. (Comp. John iv. 25.)

spiritual tendency which characterized the constantly oppressed people received no scientific improvement. In the mean time there appeared in the first century in succession three founders of sects, of whom *Dositheus*[7] departed from the prevalent Samaritan Judaism in a very few particulars. *Simon Magus*[8] drew the germ of his syncretic magical system from the philosophical opinions then current, probably at Alexandria, and unfolded them farther, instigated perhaps by Christianity, which had

[7] Moshemii institt. hist. Christ. majores Saec. i., 376 ss. דּוֹסִתַּאי gave himself out to be the prophet promised in Deut. xviii. 18. The church fathers falsely ascribe to him many peculiar doctrines which were held by all the Samaritans. (According to Jewish tradition, the priest sent by Sennacherib, 1 Kings xvii. 27, 28, was one R. Dosthai. Drusius de tribus sectis Jud. iii. 4. It is probable, therefore, that the two persons were confounded.) A strict ascetic life and an overscrupulous observance of the Sabbath were peculiar to him. Origen. de princ. iv., c. 17, quo quisque corporis situ in principio sabbathi inventus fuerit, in eo ad vesperum usque ipsi permanendum esse, manifestly a literal interpretation of Exod. xvi. 29.—As late as the year 588, the Dositheans and Samaritans had a controversy in Egypt about Deut. xviii. 18. (Eulogius ap. Phot. bibl. cod. 230.)

[8] Mosheim l. c., p. 289—432. Walch's Historie der Ketzereien i., 135 ff. Neander's gnostische Systeme. Berlin, 1818. S. 338 ff. Leben u. Lehre Simons d. Magiers, by Dr A. Simson (in Illgens Zeitschr. für histor. Theol., 1841., iii., 15). Act. viii. 9, 10. *Σίμων—μαγεύων καὶ ἐξιστῶν τὸ ἔθνος τῆς Σαμαρείας, λέγων εἶναί τινα ἑαυτὸν μέγαν.* By the people he was looked upon as *ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ μεγάλη* (חַיִל cf. not. 6). Probably the *Σίμων Ἰουδαῖος, Κύπριος δὲ γένος, μάγος εἶναι σκηπτόμενος* apud Joseph. Ant. xx., 7, 2. Fabulous accounts of his death at Rome (first found in the Apostol. Constitut. vi., 9, and in Arnobius ii., c. 12) were perhaps occasioned by the occurrence related in Sueton. in Nerone, c. 12. Juvenal. Sat. iii., 79, 80. The statue on the island in the Tiber, as Justin relates., apol. maj., c. 26 and 56, with the inscription Simoni sancto Deo, was found in 1574, and has on it, Semoni Sanco Deo Fidio Sacrum, &c. (See Baronius ad ann. 44. no. 55.) On Semo Sancus or Sangus, comp. Ovid. Fast. v., 213. Justin's mistake is apparent, although Baronius, Thirlby, Maranus, especially Fogginius de Romano Divi Petro itinere et episcopatu, Florent. 1741, 4to, p. 247 ss., wish to justify his account; and Braun (S. Justini M. Apologiæ. Bonnae 1830, p. 97) has promised a new defence of it. The followers of Simon must be regarded as Samaritan Gnostics, (Justin. M. Apol. maj. c. 26: *καὶ σχεδὸν πάντες μὲν Σαμαρεῖς, ὀλίγοι δὲ καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις ἔθνεσιν, ὡς τὸν πρῶτον θεὸν ἐκεῖνον ὁμολογοῦντες, ἐκεῖνον καὶ προσκυνοῦσι*), whose system may have been developed parallel with the Christian Gnosis. Among Christians Simon has always been looked upon as the master and progenitor of all heretics, (Irenaeus adv. haer. i. 27, ii. praef.), and although he never was a Christian, yet, in later times, he was thought to be the first here-

lately appeared. In the third place, *Menander*,[9] the disciple of Simon Magus, departed little from the footsteps of his master. All three left behind them sects which continued for several centuries. The followers of Simon and Menander were often confounded with Christians by the heathen,[10] and actually endeavoured to insinuate themselves into the Christian church after Christianity had become the prevailing religion.[11]

§ 19.

RELATION OF THE TIMES TO CHRISTIANITY IN ITS INFANCY.

From the view that has been given it may be seen, that the popular religions of the heathen had become superannuated at the time of Christ, and that unbelief and superstition were on the point of putting an end to all true religion. It is further apparent, that Judaism, losing more and more its spiritual character, threatened to sink down in externalities. Under these circumstances many heathens must have longed for a religion which put an end to their doubts and agitations, satisfied the demands of their moral nature, and afforded them consolation and inward peace. The circumstance of Christianity coming from the east, whose mystical religions had at that time attracted general attention to itself, must have facilitated at least the introduction of it. Nor could it be otherwise than that many Jews felt the emptiness of their ceremonial service, especially as they had been already guided to a more spiritual worship of God by many passages in their own prophets. On the other hand, expectations of the Messiah prepared the way for Christianity among the Jews.

But however much there was in the circumstances of these times which must have promoted Christianity, there was not less to obstruct it. Among the Jews, national pride, earthly hopes

siarch. In the Clementines he is the representative of Gnosis generally, and the system there attributed to him is a compound of the most striking Gnostic positions, and must not be considered genuine, (see Baur's christl. Gnosis, p. 302).

[9] Mosheim l. c. 432—438.

[10] Justin. apol. ii. p. 70.

[11] Regarding the Simonians see Euseb. hist. eccl. ii. 1, 4. For the Menandrians, iii. 26, 2.

of Messiah, and habituation to an almost external religion, among the heathen, unbelief as well as superstition, which prevailed at this time, the stain attaching to Jewish origin, and the political grounds which, in the universal opinion, rendered it necessary to abide by the national religion. Christianity could reckon on toleration on the part of the state, agreeably to the principles of the Romans, only as long as it was confined to the Jewish people. But a religion which, like the Jewish, did not only declare all other national religions false, but was likewise gathering adherents among all nations in a much greater degree than the Jewish, and was threatening to extinguish all others, could not be endured by the Roman government without an abandonment of the old state religion. The toleration which all philosophical systems and foreign superstitions found at Rome could not, therefore, be expected by Christianity;[1] for an external observance of the state religion was at least consistent with the nature of such systems and superstitions.[2]

FIRST CHAPTER.

THE LIFE OF JESUS.

J. J. Hess Lebensgeschichte Jesu, 3 Bde. 8te Aufl. Zürich 1822 u. 23. 8. The same: Lehre, Thaten, und Schicksale unseres Herrn, von verschiedenen Seiten beleuchtet. 2 Hälften. 3te Aufl. Zürich 1817. 8. J. G. Herder vom Erlöser der Menschen nach unsern 3 ersten Evangelien. Riga 1796. 8. The same: von Gottes Sohn der Welt Heiland, nach Johannis Evangel. Riga 1797. 8. J. Ch. Greiling das Leben Jesu von Nazareth. Halle 1815. 8. H. E. G. Paulus das Leben Jesu, als Grundlage einer inen Gesch. d. Urchristenthums. Heidelb. 1828. 2 Bde. 8. Dr

[1] Although the Christian apologists often appeal to it, Justini M. apol. maj. c. 18, 24, 26. Tertulliani apologeticus, c. 24, 46.

[2] In opposition to the wrong views taken by Voltaire traité sur la tolérance 1763, c. 8—10, (Oeuvres éd. Deux-Ponts. Tom. 40, p. 271 ss.), relative to the toleration of the Romans, and the exclusive fault of the Christians in bringing persecutions on themselves, Hegewisch made very just remarks in his treatise on the epoch in Roman history most favourable to humanity. Hamburg 1800. P. 173.

A. Hase das Leben Jesu. Ein Lehrbuch zunächst für akadem. Vorlesungen. Leipz. 1829. 3te Aufl. 1840. 8.—Dr Strauss's Leben Jesu has given a new shock to a scientific treatment of the subject. Tübinger 1835. 36. 4te Aufl. 1840. 2 Bde. 8. The fruits of it are especially A. Neander's Leben Jesu Christi. Hamburg 1837. (4te Aufl. 1845.) 8. Chr. F. v. Ammon Gesch. d. Lebens Jesu mit steter Rücksicht auf die vorhandenen Quellen. Bd. 1. Leipzig 1842. 8.

F. V. Reinhard Versuch über den Plan, den der Stifter der christl. Religion zum Besten der Menschen entwarf. 5te Ausg. with additions by Heubner. Wittenb. 1830. 8. G. J. Planck Gesch. d. Christenth. in der Periode seiner ersten Einführung in die Welt durch Jesum und die Apostel. Göttingen 1818. 2 Bde 8.

J. A. G. Meyer Versuch einer Vertheidigung und Erläuterung der Geschichte Jesu und der Apostel allein aus griech. und röm. Profanscribenten. Hannover 1805. 8.

§ 20.

CHRONOLOGICAL DATA RESPECTING THE LIFE OF JESUS.

J. F. Wurm's astron. Beiträge zur genäherten Bestimmung des Geburts u. Todesjahres Jesu, in Bengel's Archiv. für d. Theol. II., 1, 261. R. Anger de temporum in Actis Apost. ratione diss. c. 1, de anno quo Jesus in coelum ascenderit. Lips. 1830. 8. F. Piper de externa vitæ J. Chr. chronologia recte constituenda. Gottingae 1835. 4. K. Wieseler's chronolog. Synopse der vier Evangelien. Hamburg 1843. 8.[1]

[1] According to Wieseler, Christ was born in February 750 A.U. (4 B.C.), baptized in spring or summer 780, (27 A.D.), crucified on the 7th April 783, (30 A.D.). A work so acute and learned as that of Wieseler cannot be sufficiently characterised in a few words. The exact coincidence, however, of different investigations produces more doubt than conviction, since the separate data may be bent, on account of their vacillating nature, in subservience to one object, without completely removing scruples in regard to them. In particular, ὡσεί, in Luke iii. 23, p. 126, appears to be taken too strictly; it is incredible that the chronological designation of Luke iii. 1 should reach to the captivity of the Baptist,

The only definite date in the evangelical history[2] is in Luke iii. 1, relating to the appearance of John the Baptist.[3] On the supposition that Jesus appeared in public half a year after John as he was born half a year after him, the designation of his age in Luke iii. 23 gives nearly the time of his birth, which, perhaps, may be still more closely determined by the circumstance that it must have happened before the death of Herod, († shortly before the passover, 750 A.U.), Matth. ii. 1, 19.[4] Even in the first centuries accounts of the year of Jesus' birth are given;[5] but the Romish abbot Dionysius Exiguus, (525) reckoned, inde-

p. 197; and the computation of the Jewish calendar, borrowed by Wurm for the purpose of ascertaining the year of Jesus' death, appears to be wholly uncertain, according to Wurm's explanations.

[2] Doubtful chronological dates are: Luc. i. 5, ἐφημερία Ἀβιά, (cf. 1 Chron. xxiv. 10. Jos. Scaliger de emendat. temporum. App. p. 54. Wieseler, s. 140. Comp. Paulus Comm. über die drei ersten Evang. i. 36 ff. Luc. ii. 2, the Census of Quirinus, (cf. Jos. Ant. XVIII. i. 1. Paulus i. 141 ff. On the contrary, P. A. E. Huschke über den zur Zeit d. Geburt J. Chr. gehaltenen Census. Breslau 1840. 8. Wieseler S. 49. Comp. Hoeck's röm. Gesch. vom Verfall d. Republik b. Constantin. i. ii. 412).—Joh. ii. 20. The building of the temple, (cf. Jos. Ant. xv. 11, 1; xx. 9, 7. Lampe, Paulus, and Lücke on John. Wieseler, s. 165.)

[3] Augustus died 19th August, the year 14 of our era, and thus the 15th year of Tiberius's reign fell between the 19th August 28 and the 19th August 29, (781—2, A.U.C.), Wurm in Bengel's Archiv. ii. 5.

[4] On the year of Herod's death see Klaiber's Studien d. evangel. Geistlichkeit Wirtemberg's i. 1, 50. Wurm in the same i. ii. 208. A list of the various opinions concerning the year of Christ's birth may be seen in Fabricii bibliographia antiquaria ed. 2, Hamb. 1716, 4to, p. 187 ss., continued in F. Münter's der Stern der Weisen u. s. w. Kopenh. 1827, p. 109. The latest important investigations unite in the year 747 A.U. So Henr. Sanclementii de vulgaris aerae emendatione libb. iv. Romae 1793, fol., solely on historical grounds. Münter, on the same grounds, and, also, because he regards with Keppler the star of the wise men as the great conjunction of the planets Jupiter and Saturn in Pisces, which happened on that year. Ideler chronol. ii. 394 ff. Piper l. c. Schubert Lehrb. d. sternenkunde s. 227, Winer bibl. Realwörterbuch ii. 614, assent to these results. Compare, however, on the other side, Wurm in Klaiber's Studien i. ii. 211 ff.

[5] Irenaeus iii. 25, and Tertull. adv. Jud. 8, give the 41st year of Augustus 751 A.U. On the other hand, Clemens. Alex. strom. i. p. 339, the 28th year, (namely, after the conquest of Egypt), with whom agrees Euseb. hist. eccl. i. 5. Epiphan. haer. li. 22, and Orosius histor. i. 1, the 42d year, 752 A.U.—Sulpicius Severus hist. sacr. ii. 27, gives the 33d year of Herod Coss. Sabinus and Rufinus, (which does not suit, as Sab.

pendently of them, the period of the incarnation for the purpose of fixing by it the years in his table for Easter, making the first year from the incarnation coincide with the year 754 A.U. of the Varronian computation.[6] This Dionysian era, applied first of all under the Anglo-Saxons,[7] then by the Frankish kings Pepin and Charlemagne, begins at least four years after the true date of Christ's birth.[8] The day of birth cannot be determined.[9]

The ministry of Jesus was supposed by many of the older church fathers, after the example of the Alexandrians, to have continued one year, agreeably to Isaiah lxi. 1, 2, comp. Luke iv. 19, (*ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτόν*).[10] On this was founded the hypothe-

and Ruf. were consuls 751 A.U., Herod died after a reign of 37 years, 750 A.U. An Egyptian monk Panodorus (after 400) placed the birth of Christ in the year 5493 of his aera, i.e., 754 A.U. (Ge. Syncelli chronographia. ed. Paris, p. 25, 326.)

[6] The Incarnatio, *σάρκωσις*, always means in the fathers the annunciation. Dionysius, therefore, placed the birth of Christ in the conclusion of the first year of his era. When first, about the time of Charlemagne, the beginning of the year was made to coincide with the 25th of December, the incarnation appears to have been taken as synonymous with the nativity. See Sanclementius iv. c. 8. Ideler's chronologie ii. 381 ff.

[7] Ethelbert, king of Kent, dated first of all an original document anno ab incarnatione Christi DCV. cf. Codex diplomaticus aevi Saxonici, opera J. M. Kemble. T. i. (Lond. 1839. 8.) p. 2. Afterwards the venerable Bede used this era in his historical works.

[8] G. A. Hamberger de epochae christianae ortu et auctore. Jenae 1688. 4. (in Martini thesaur. dissertatt. T. iii. P. i. p. 241). Jo. G. Jani. historia aerae Dionysianae. Viteb. 1715. 4. (also in his opuscula ad hist. et chronolog. spectantia ed. Klotz. Halae 1769). Ideler's Chronologie. ii. 366 ff.

[9] Clem. Alex. strom. i. p. 340, relates, that some regarded the 25th of Pachon, (20th May), others the 24th or 25th Pharmuthi, (the 19th or 20th April), as the birth-day. After the 6th of January, solemnized as a day of baptism by the followers of Basilides, was kept by the Oriental Christians since the third century as the day of baptism and birth, people began to keep this day as the true day of birth, (Epiphan. haer. li. 21). After the 25th December was solemnized in the fourth century in the west, as the birth-festival, this day came soon to be looked upon as the day of birth, (Sulpic. Sever. hist. sacr. ii. 27).

[10] So the Valentinians, (Irenaeus ii. 38, 39), in opposition to whom Irenaeus puts forth the singular assertion that Jesus was baptized in his thirtieth year, but did not appear as a teacher till between his fortieth and fiftieth, (John viii. 57), and then taught three years. One year, however, was adopted by Clem. Alex. Strom. i. 340. Origenes hom. 32 in Lucam and de princip. iv. On the other hand, c. Cels. ii. p. 397,

sis, which became almost traditional in the ancient church, that Jesus was crucified in his thirtieth year, Coss. Rubellius Geminus and Fufius Geminus,[11] (in the 15th year of Tiberius, 29th of the Dionysian era). But, according to the gospel of John ii. 13, (v. 1), vi. 4, xi. 55, three, or perhaps four passovers, happened during the public ministry of Christ. It must, therefore, have continued more than two years, and may, perhaps, have extended over three. Thus, the year of his death falls between 31 and 33 aer. Dionys., making his age from thirty-four to thirty-eight years. Even if we could agree on the preliminary question whether the Friday on which Jesus died was the day before the passover, or the first day of the passover;[12] yet, amid the uncertainty of the Jewish calendar of that time, an astronomical reckoning of the year of his death can scarcely be established.[13]

and Comment. in Matth. xxiv. 15, he says, that Judas was not three entire years with Jesus. Auct. Clementin. hom. 17 in fine, Julius Africanus (ap. Hieronym. in Dan. ix.) Philastrius haer. 106. Cyrill. Alex. in Esaiam, c. 32. Some moderns have attained to a similar result in another way. Priestley's harmony of the Evangelists in Greek 1777. Haenlein progr. de temporis quo Jesus cum Apostolis versatus est, duratione. Erlang. 1796, 4to.

[11] Tertull. adv. Jud. 8. (but comp. adv. Marcion. i. 15). Lactant. institutt. iv. 10. Augustin. de civ. Dei. xviii. 54, de trinit. iv. 5, (according to Tertull. and August. ll. cc. and according to the old Acta Pilati in Epiphan. haer. l. 1, he was crucified the 8th of the Kalends of April, on the 25th of March, the day of the vernal equinox, comp. Thilo cod. apocr. N. T. i. 496. Wieseler, s. 390.) That Christ was thirty years old: Hippolytus Portuensis in canone paschali. Chronicon anonymi (in Canis. lect. antiq. T. ii.) c. 17 u. 18. Hieronym. epist. 22. ad Eustochium. Augustin. epist. 80 and 99. Comp. Petavii rationarium temporum (ed. Ludg. 1745). P. ii. p. 266 ss.

[12] The first three evangelists designate the last supper as the passover, (Matth. xxvi. 17, ss., Mark xiv. 12, Luke xxii. 7), and hence it has been usually assumed in the Western Church that Christ was crucified on the first day of the passover. On the contrary, the day of Christ's death was according to John xiii. 1, 29, xviii. 28, xix. 14, 31, the day before the passover. The latter is followed by Tertullian, adv. Jud. c. 8, the Greeks, Scaliger, Casaubon, Capellus, Lampe, Kuinoel, &c. It is strongly in favour of the latter hypothesis that the first day of the passover can never fall on a Friday, at least according to the present calendar of the Jews. See Ideler's chronologie, Bd. i. p. 519. Probably the account of the first three evangelists is to be explained by the circumstance, that they took the last supper of Jesus to be the Christian passover; see Theile in Winer's Krit. Journal der Theol. Literat. ii. 153 ff., v. 129 ff. Comp. Hase's Leben Jesu, p. 167. [Bibliotheca Sacra, new series, 1845, an article by Robinson.]

[13] Bynaeus de morte J. C. libb. 3. Amstel. 1691. 98, 3 voll. 4.

§ 21.

HISTORY OF THE YOUTH OF JESUS.

The history of Jesus' life before his public appearance is very obscure,[1] and affords no disclosures in relation to the important question of the mode and progress of his spiritual development. Modern scholars have endeavoured to supply this deficiency by conjectures, and have attributed a decided influence on his character, sometimes to the doctrines of the *Essenes*,[2] sometimes to those of the *Sadducees*,[3] sometimes to a combination of *Pharisaism* and *Sadduceism*,[4] sometimes to an *Alexandrian-Jewish* education.[5] But such a spirit could not have received its direction from any school, and least of all from the schools of those times, which were better adapted to fetter the spirit, partly by

Paulus über die Möglichkeit Jesu Todesjahr zu bestimmen, in his Comment. über das N. T. iii. 784. Wurm in Bengel's Archiv. ii. 261.

[1] Chr. Fr. Ammon's bibl. Theologie. Bd. 2, (2te Ausg. Erlangen 1801) s. 244 ff. Paulus Commentar über das neue Testament Th. 1. Schleiermacher on the writings of Luke. Th. 1. Berlin 1817. S. 23 ff. [Translated by Thirlwall, Lond. 8vo, 1825.]

[2] So first the English Deists, (see against them Prideaux's Connection) From them Voltaire borrowed this idea, as well as many others, (Philosophical Dictionary under Essèniens). Frederic the Great, oeuvres ed. de Berlin, T. xi. p. 94. Stäudlin Geschichte der Sittenlehre Jesu, Th. 1. S. 570 ff. The same hypothesis has been enlarged in J. A. C. Richter das Christenthum und die aeltesten Religionen des Orients. Leipzig 1819. Christianity is supposed to be the public revelation of the Essene doctrines, and that these were connected with the ancient schools of the prophets, with Parsism, the Egyptian and Grecian mysteries, and through them with Brahmaism! According to Gfrörer, (das Heiligthum u. die Wahrheit. Stuttgart, 1838, s. 382), Jesus was educated among the Essenes, and afterwards followed his own course, but continued to hold what was sound in their doctrines and customs. On the other side see Bengel über d. Versuch, d. Christenth. a. d. Essenismus abzuleiten, in Flatt's Magazine vii., 148 ff. Heubner in the 5th appendix to his edition of Reinhard's Versuch über d. Plan Jesu. v. Wegnern uber das Verhältniss des Christenthums zum Essenismus, in Illgen's Zeitschrift fur die histor. Theol. 1841, ii. 1.

[3] Des-Cotes Schutzschrift fur Jesum v. Nazareth. Frankf. 1797.

[4] Versuch den Ursprung der Sittenlehre Jesu historisch zu erklären (in Henke's Magazin. Bd. 5. S. 426.)

[5] Bahrdt's Briefe über die Bibel im Volkstone. Berlin 1784 ff.

their literal externality, partly by their fanatical idealism, than to prepare it for a clear and great self-development.[6] On the contrary, the reading of the prophets of the Old Testament must have quickened in the kindred spirit a religious feeling as spiritual as that of the time was literal and carnal, and must have given it a measure for estimating the condition of the Jewish nation at that period, and for judging of the means by which alone it could be elevated, very different from the usual view.

§ 22.

JOHN THE BAPTIST.

William Bell's Inquiry into the divine mission of John the Baptist and Jesus Christ. Lond. 1761, 8vo. Translated into German by Henke, Braunschweig, 1779, 8vo. J. G. E. Leopold Johannes d. T., eine biblische Untersuchung. Hannover 1825. 8. Joh. d. T. in s. Leben u. Wirken dargestellt nach den Zeugnissen d. h. Schrift von L. v. Rohden. Lübeck 1838. 8.

Before Jesus, appeared one of his relatives John, in the wilderness of Judea, with the solemn call, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," and dedicating his followers to this altered state of mind by a symbolical washing of the body.[1] It is certain that John and Jesus had been earlier acquainted with

[6] So in John vii. 15, all higher cultivation in any school is denied to Jesus.

[1] Was the baptism of John an imitation of Jewish proselyte baptism? The question is answered in the affirmative by Buxtorf lexic. talmud. p. 408. Lightfoot, Schoettgen, Wetstein ad Matth. iii. 6. J. A. Danz baptismus proselytorum Judaicus ad illustrandum baptismum Joannis, and his antiquitas baptismi initiationis Israelitarum vindicata (both contained in Meuschen N. T. ex talmude illustratum. Lips. 1736. 4,. p. 233 u. 287 ss.) W. C. L. Ziegler über die Johannistaufe als unveränderte Anwendung der jüdischen Proselytentaufe (in his theol. Abhandlungen. Bd. 2. Göttingen 1804, s. 132 ff.) E. G. Bengel über das Alter der jüd. Proselytentaufe. Tübingen 1814. 8.—On the other hand, others deny that Jewish proselyte baptism existed so early. Among the moderns, Paulus Comment. Th. 1, s. 278, de Wette comment. de morte J. C. expiatoria. Berol. 1813. p. 42 ss. J. G. Reiche de baptismatis origine et necessitate necnon de formula baptismali. Goeting. 1816. 8. D. M. Schneckenburger über das Alter der jüdischen Proselytentaufe. Berlin 1828. 8. Purification, as a symbol of moral cleansing, is mentioned as early as in the writings of the prophets, Ezek. xxxvi. 25, Zech. xiii. 1.

one another; but it is improbable that there existed a close connection between them, or the concerting of a common plan. The peculiarities of John point to an earlier connection with the Essenes.[2] The same character was possessed by his disciples, who, after Jesus' appearance, continued apart from the disciples of the latter, (John iii. 26; Luke v. 33; Matth. ix. 14; xi. 2 ff.),[3] and of whom we meet with remains in Asia Minor, long after John himself had fallen a sacrifice to his intrepidity (Acts xviii. 25; xix. 1 ff.).[4]

[2] Even the place of his appearance ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῆς Ἰουδαίας (Matth. iii. 1), where, according to Plin. nat. hist. v. c. 17, the Essenes also dwelt.

[3] There is a remarkable testimony concerning John in Jos. Ant. xviii. 5, 2, (first mentioned by Orig. c. Cels. i. p. 35). Κτείνει τοῦτον (Ἰωάννην) Ἡρώδης, ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους κελεύοντα, ἀρετὴν ἐπασκοῦντας, καὶ τῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλους δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐσεβείᾳ χρωμένους, βαπτισμῷ συνιέναι· οὕτω γὰρ καὶ τὴν βάπτισιν ἀποδεκτὴν αὐτῷ φανεῖσθαι, μὴ ἐπί τινων ἁμαρτάδων παραιτήσει χρωμένων, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἁγνείᾳ τοῦ σώματος, ἅτε δὴ καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς δικαιοσύνῃ προεκκεκαθαρμένης· καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συστρεφομένων, καὶ γὰρ ἥδιστα ἐπὶ πλεῖστον τῇ ἀκροάσει τῶν λόγων, δείσας Ἡρώδης τὸ ἐπὶ τοσόνδε πιθανὸν αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις μὴ ἐπὶ ἀποστάσει τινὶ φέροι, πάντα γὰρ ἐῴκεσαν συμβουλῇ τῇ ἐκείνου πράξοντες, πολὺ κρεῖττον ἡγεῖται, πρίν τι νεώτερον ἐξ αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι, προλαβὼν ἀναιρεῖν, ἢ μεταβολῆς γενομένης εἰς τὰ πράγματα ἐμπεσὼν μετανοεῖν. καὶ ὁ μὲν, ὑποψίᾳ τῇ Ἡρώδου, δέσμιος εἰς τὸν Μαχαιροῦντα πεμφθεὶς—ταύτῃ κτίννυται· τοῖς δὲ Ἰουδαίοις δόξα, ἐπὶ τιμωρίᾳ τῇ ἐκείνου τὸν ὄλεθρον ἐπὶ τῷ στρατεύματι γενέσθαι, τοῦ θεοῦ κακῶς Ἡρώδῃ θέλοντος.

[4] Cf. Recog. Clem. i. 54 and 60. In the middle of the 17th century, the existence of a sect was made known by Carmelite missionaries, whose head-quarters were Basrah and Suster, calling themselves Nazoreans, (not to be confounded with the Muhammedan sect Nasaireans), or Mendeans, but by the Muhammedans they were named Sabians, (Sabaei, probably the name was borrowed from the star-worshippers of the Koran). They got the name Christians of St John from the missionaries. Cf. Ignatii a Jesu narratio originis, rituum et errorum Christianorum S. Johannis. Rom. 1652, 8vo. After one of their holy books was published entire, (Codex Nasireaeus, liber Adami appellatus, Syriace transcriptus latineque redditus a Matth. Norberg. 3 Thle. Lond. 1815, 1816, 4to.) fragments of two others (the Divan and the book of John) communicated to the world, and many accounts furnished by travellers, Gesenius gave a critical survey of their system in the Universal Encyclopædia of Ersch and Gruber, (Leipzig 1817), article Zabier, from which it appears that the system is Gnostic-ascetic nearly related to that of the Valentinians and Ophites, John appearing as an incarnate aeon. The language of their sacred books is an Aramaean dialect, which occupies a middle position between the Syriac and Chaldee. They allege that they came from Jordan, from whence they were driven by the Muhammedans. Most scholars assume the descent of this sect from the

§ 23.

THE PUBLIC LIFE AND MINISTRY OF JESUS.

Jesus also came out of Galilee to Jordan to be baptised by John, and was recognised in such a way by the latter that he considered it more befitting to receive baptism from Jesus than the contrary. The import of this is, that the Baptist looked upon himself as called to higher purity. This baptism was to Jesus the consecration to his Messianic activity. It is true that he began with the same call to his nation as John the Baptist (Matth. iv. 17); but he soon unfolded a far more comprehensive system in the discharge of his ministry, which, though it directly affected the Jewish people only, yet in its very nature belonged to all humanity. The Jewish people at that time presented an aspect the most deserving of compassion. In the deepest external degradation, always cherishing the most extravagant hopes in regard to the immediate future, they were exposed by their very religion to the corruption into which they sank. And yet this very religion when judged, not by the partial, priestly form which it had then received, but as drawn from its original documents, and pervaded by the living prophetic spirit which animated it as there described, must have marvellously revealed itself to every human breast as directly certain, as the only true source of human happiness. It was the aim and object of Jesus to awaken, by his life and doctrine, this prophetic element of the Mosaic religion, but in a purer form and in greater development, among his countrymen; and to bring it into the hearts of men as a spontaneous principle of action. By such spiritual regeneration alone could the Jewish people be delivered even from external corruption; and we cannot doubt that Jesus would gladly have effected this outward deliverance also. But his plan extended far wider, although the germs which lay in the compass of his ministry proceeded forth, and became visible, for the most

disciples of John the Baptist. Les Nazoréens, thèse de Theologie historique par C. E. Burckhardt. Strasbourg 1840, 8vo. On the other side see O. G. Tychsen in the Deutsches Museum, 1784, Th. 2. S. 414, (who, however, confounds the Nazoreans with another sect, Burckhardt, p. 11, 107). Baumgarten-Crusius bibl. Theol. S. 143.

part, only after he had left our world. Jesus appeared first in Galilee, and resided not at Nazareth (Luke iv. 24), but usually at *Capernaum*. From this place, however, he not only traversed Galilee, but often abode for a long time in Judea in his journeys to the festivals at Jerusalem. He was only in Samaria occasionally, as he went through it; and we find him but once beyond the confines of Judea (Mark vii. 24 ff.) By degrees he drew around him twelve young men, illiterate (Matth. xi. 25), and from the lower orders of society, for the purpose of initiating them into his spirit and plan by their living with him and continually receiving his instructions. They accompanied him in his smaller journeys on which he appeared, sometimes among small domestic circles, sometimes in synagogues, sometimes among great multitudes under the canopy of heaven; and much as he attracted to himself universal attention by the extraordinary works he wrought, he excited no less astonishment and wonder by his doctrine, which directly convinced and carried captive the hearer (Matth. vii. 28, 29; Luke iv. 32). At first he avoided observation (Matth. ix. 30); he even forbade the disciples to make him known as the Messiah (Matth. xvi. 20); but afterwards he declared himself to be the promised Messiah with a firmness which forbids the idea of mere accommodation (Matth. xvi. 20, 26, 64). But the religious ideas of the Old Testament had obtained within him a new and higher life, reaching far beyond the local and temporal form handed down among the Jews by tradition.[1] The Old Testament conception of a *Theocracy* was transformed in him into the high idea of the *kingdom of God*, in which men, animated by the Spirit of God, should be united with Deity and one another in moral unity. This kingdom of God he wished, as the Messiah, to establish on earth; on which account he required of his contemporaries, sunk as they were in the external and the literal, first of all, *change of heart*, that they might be susceptible of the Spirit of God; next, *faith* in himself as the Christ, that by yielding itself up to the higher spirit, even the weaker mind might be elevated to free communion with God. It follows, of course, that nothing stood more in his way than that *Pharisaic righteousness* which rested on works. Hence he levelled his attacks chiefly against *it*. He

[1] Chr. F. Böhme die Religion Jesu Christi aus ihren Urkunden dargestellt. Halle, 1825. 2te Aufl. 1827. 8.

did not indeed abolish the ceremonial law of Moses, constantly observing it himself; but he could not look upon it in any other light than as an expression of inward religious feeling; and all value attached to religious external observances, independently of true devotional feelings, was worthless in his eyes (Matth. xii. 1 ff.; xv. 1 ff.; v. 24; xii. 9). So far as he designated the free development of this internal religious feeling, the only genuine religious culture, it necessarily followed from his doctrine, and must have been sooner or later expressed publicly by his disciples, that no religious law for men can be in the form of a rule that requires something *merely external*. Thus the removal of the ceremonial law necessarily followed his teachings. In like manner Jesus confined his immediate efforts to the Jews alone, and avoided coming in contact with those who were not Jews, out of regard to the very prejudices of his nation (Matth. x. 5; xv. 21—28). But still there lay always in his doctrine, which rejected all reliance on externalities, an adaptation for all mankind, as he himself often intimated with sufficient distinctness (Matth. viii. 11, 21, 43).

While Jesus endeavoured to guide his disciples to this purer religion and moral communion in the kingdom of God, he also drew them gradually away from the common notion of retribution which prevailed among the Jews, (Luke xiii. 2 ff.; John ix. 2, 3,) announced to them the forgiveness of sins in the way of repentance and faith, and then taught them, in this inward communion with God, to meet all external fortunes with submission, and confidence, and the firmest trust in God, (Matth. vi. 33; x. 28). The kingdom of God, as it was then begun, was only an inward thing (Luke xvii. 21), in continual conflict with the world and with evil; but Jesus promised that he should appear again, to judge the evil, and to place piety and happiness in their natural relation, in the kingdom of God, (Matth. xxiv. 30; xxv. 31). The notion of such a triumphant kingdom of God had been already set forth, though in a sensuous form, in the description given of Messiah's reign; and since it could be spoken of generally only in figures, Jesus borrowed his figures from it, giving at the same time sufficient intimation of a more spiritual, universal, and purer view. (Matth. xxii. 30). It could not be otherwise than that these figures should be more or less spiritually understood, according to the different degrees of religious culture: but the leading idea on which all depended, the

idea of a future adjustment of the relation of happiness to piety in the kingdom of God triumphant, must have always been maintained. The disciples, accustomed to entertain the conception of an earthly Messianic kingdom, not only took all those images in a sensuous acceptation, but also introduced into them many minute definitions. Thus, although Jesus had declared the point of time when he should come again, to be a secret with God the Father, (Matth. xxiv. 36), yet they annexed to the admonition to be always ready (Matth. xxiv. 43, 44), the expectation of the near approach of his coming (Matth. xvi. 27). These sensuous expectations could not at once be eradicated from their minds, without at the same time endangering their faith in Jesus; but they were gradually purified and spiritualised by a series of events. Probably the closing fortunes of Jesus' life, though even they did not destroy those sensuous hopes, were required to convince the disciples that God's ways are very different from man's expectations; and to confirm their faith in the Divine mission of Jesus; while at the same time they furnished the highest example of a mind renouncing the earthly, entirely devoted to God, and of a self-sacrificing love.

The Pharisees contemporary with Jesus, affected and exasperated by the truth of his doctrine, did not rest till they had brought him to the death he had long foreseen (Matth. ix. 15; xvi. 21—*et seq.*) Delivered up to them by a disciple, after he instituted shortly before a *covenant-supper*, as a symbol of internal union with him, and of unity among his disciples themselves, he was accused by them of insurrection before *Pontius Pilate*, and condemned by him through unworthy views. The courage of the disciples, which had almost vanished away, returned after his resurrection with so much strength and purity, that an unshaken attachment to Jesus was now to be expected from them, even amid outward renunciations of His cause. It was still reserved, however, for later occurrences to correct many remaining prejudices. Thus it was some time before they fully understood the last commission of Jesus to carry the glad news of the beginning of God's kingdom on earth to all nations, to invite all into it, and to initiate them into it by baptism.

[2] Chr. F. Boehme de spe Messiana apostolica. Halae, 1826. 8.

§ 24.

ALLEGED CONTEMPORARY NOTICES OF JESUS NOT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The testimony concerning Christ in Josephus, Ant. xviii. 3, 3, is regarded with the greatest probability as genuine, but interpolated.[1] On the contrary, *the correspondence of Christ with*

[1] Γίνεται δὲ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον Ἰησοῦς, σοφὸς ἀνήρ, [εἴγε ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρή· ἦν γὰρ] παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητής, [διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων τῶν σὺν ἡδονῇ τἀληθῆ δεχομένων], καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ ἐπηγάγετο. [Ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν.] Καὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδείξει τῶν πρώτων ἀνδρῶν παρ' ἡμῖν σταυρῷ ἐπιτετιμηκότος Πιλάτου οὐκ ἐξεπαύσαντο οἱ τὸ πρῶτον αὐτὸν ἀγαπήσαντες. [Ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἔχων ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν, τῶν θείων προφητῶν ταῦτά τε καὶ ἄλλα μυρία περὶ αὐτοῦ θαυμάσια εἰρηκότων.] Εἰσέτι τε νῦν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀπὸ τοῦδε ὠνομασμένων οὐκ ἐπέλιπε τὸ φῦλον. This passage was first mentioned and cited by Eusebius (hist. eccles. i. 11, demonstr. evangel. iii. 5), and for a long time repeated by succeeding writers without any hesitation. The first who entertained doubts of its authenticity were Hubert Gifanius ICtus (the letter in refutation of Sebastianus Lepusculus dd. Basileae the 24. Febr. 1559. See in Melch. Goldasti centuria epistolarum philologicarum Nro. 61), and Lucas Osiander (in Epitome hist. eccles. Centur. i. lib. 2. cap. 7. Tubing. 1592). More searching investigations of various scholars, respecting the matter from 1646—1661, first occasioned by the Altdorf. Professor Sebastian Snellius, who denied the authenticity, are collected in: Epistolae xxx. philol. et hist. de Fl. Jos. testim., quod J. C. tribuit, rec. Christoph. Arnold. Noriberg. 1661. 12. (also in Havercamp's edition of Josephus, tom. ii. Append. p. 233). Here the reasons against it are developed with superior skill, especially by Dav. Blondel and Tanaquil Faber. Later defenders are: Carol. Daubuz pro testimonio Flavii Josephi de Jesu Christo, libb. ii. Londini, 1706. 8. (also in Havercamp's Josephus, tom. ii. Append. p. 187). Houteville erwiesene Wahrheit der christl. Religion durch ihre Geschichte. Frankf. 1745. 4. S. 275 ff. Oberthür in der Vorrede zum 2ten Theile der Uebersetzung des Josephus v. Friese. Altona, 1805. C. G. Bretschneider παέργον super Jos. de J. C. testimonio (hinter s. capit. theolog. Jud. dogm. e Fl. Josephi scriptis collect., Lips. 1812. 8. pag. 59). C. F. Böhmert über des Flav. Joseph. Zeugniss von Christo. Leipz. 1823. 8. (comp., on the other side, the review in Winer's and Engelhardt's theolog. Journ. Bd. 2. S. 95 ff.) F. H. Schoedel Flav. Josephus de J. Chr. testatus. Vindiciae Flavianae. Lips. 1840. 8. Opponents of the genuineness are: (Abbé de Longuerue) sur le passage de Joseph en faveur de Jésus-Christ (against Daubuz) in Clericus biblioth. ancienne et moderne., T. vii. p. 237. God. Lessii disertt. ii. super Josephi de Christo testimonio. Goetting. 1781.

Abgarus, toparch of Edessa,[2] and the apocryphal narratives of the birth, youth, and last days of Jesus,[3] are unquestionably

82. Eichstaedt Flaviani de J. C. testimonii αὐθεντία quo jure nuper defensa sit, quaestt. vi. Jenae, 1813—41. Arguments for the genuineness: 1. The agreement of all MSS. from the time of Eusebius. 2. The number of Christians was too great to allow Josephus to pass over their origin without mention. 3. Josephus mentions John the Baptist. Against the genuineness: 1. The silence of the fathers before Eusebius, while Josephus, in Orig. c. Cels. i. p. 35, is said to be ἀπιστῶν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ὡς Χριστῷ. 2. The passage interrupts the connection. 3. The contents betray a Christian. 4. The other Jewish historian, Justus Tiberiensis, has not mentioned Christ. Photii. Bibl. cod. 33. The assumption of interpolations which found their way into all the MSS. of Josephus out of the far more extensively circulated church history of Eusebius, is the most probable, since Josephus was read and copied only by Christians. Chrysostom appears, however, not to have been acquainted with these interpolations, since he mentions Josephus several times, and in hom. in Joann. 12, quotes his testim. de Joanne, but is silent in regard to this passage. Remarkable is the silence of Photius in his accounts regarding Jos. Archaeol. (bibl. cod. 76 and 238), especially as he remarks respecting Justus, cod. 33, that he being a Jew, and encumbered with Jewish prejudices, does not mention Jesus and his miracles. The following writers have decided in favour of an interpolation formed by altering single expressions: Knittel (nova biblioth. phil. et crit., vol. i. i. 118. Goetting., 1782. 8.) and Paulus (Heidelb. Jahrb., August 1820. S. 734). In favour of an interpolation formed by inserted glosses are: Steph. le Moyne varia sacra ii. 931, l'Abbé de Fontaines in the Journ. des savans, ann. 1723, Juill., p. 10, Paulus Comm. über die 3 ersten Evang. iii. 740, H. Olshausen hist. eccl. vet. monumenta praecipua, vol. 1. Berol. 1820. 8. p. 3. Heinichen Excursus in his edition of Eusebius. Tom. iii. p. 331. I have indicated above, by parenthetic marks, in what light I look upon the interpolation.

[2] Euseb. hist. eccl. i. 13, and Moses Chorenensis (about 440) hist. Armen. ii. 29—31, found these letters in the Archives of Edessa, and gave them to the public in a Greek and Armenian translation. At the time of Christ, Abgarus Uchomo: about 170, there was a Christian Abgarus. These letters, therefore, may have been forged long before Eusebius. Cf. Assemani bibl. Orient. t. i. p. 554. T. iii. p. 2. p. 8. Bayer historia Osrhoëna et Edessena. Petrop. 1734. 4. p. 104. Semler de Christi ad Abgarum epistola. Hal. 1768. 4. The genuineness of the letters is defended by W. F. Rinck, in Illgen's Zeitschrift f. d. histor. Theol. 1843. ii. 3.

[3] Two classes of apocryphal gospels may be distinguished: I. The older, which contained much the same cycle of narrations as the canonical; for example, the gospels of the Hebrews and of the Egyptians, &c. II. The later, which refer to the youth, the parents, and the last fortunes of Christ. A. Respecting the history of Christ's youth, we find fabulous writings first of all among the Marcosians in the second century. (Irenaeus i. c. 17.) The orthodox, at the same time, received a doc-

spurious. Still more modern are the pretended authentic *likenesses* of Jesus;[4] and the epistle of *Lentulus* to the Roman senate[5] containing a description of his person.

trinal interest in maintaining the miraculous stories of Jesus's youth in opposition to those Gnostics who asserted that the Aeon was first united with the man at the baptism of the latter. (Epiphan. haer. li., c. 20.) Several of these traditions are found in the Koran (comp. Augusti christologiae Coranicae lineamenta. Jen., 1799). Gospels of the infancy still extant are the gospel of Thomas, an Arabic gospel of the infancy, and a Latin history of the nativity of Mary and the infancy of the Saviour. At a later period the virgin Mary also began to invite men to similar fabrications. Compounds of the two are exemplified in the Protevangelism of James, the Arabic history of Joseph the carpenter, and the Latin gospel of the nativity of Mary. B. Respecting the last days of Jesus, Justin Martyr apol. i., c. 35 and 48, refers to the τὰ ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου γενόμενα ἄκτα; in the same way he himself alludes, c. 34, and also Chrysostom hom. 31. de nâtali Christi, to the acts regarding the census of Quirinus, not that he had seen them himself, but because he presupposes their existence in the Roman archives. Hence arose Christian traditions in relation to the contents of these acts, out of which Tertullian, apolog. c. 5, 21, draws the fabulous. During the persecution of Maximin, the heathen, taking occasion from these traditions, produced wicked Acta Pilati (Euseb. h. e. ix. c. 5), to which the Christians of that day had none other to oppose. The latter, however, soon made their appearance afterwards (Epiphan. haer. l. c. 1), and were fashioned and moulded in various ways. One of these fabrications has received in later times the name, gospel of Nicodemus. Cf. Henke de Pilati actis probabilia. Helmst. 1784. (opusc. academ. Lips. 1802. p. 199). W. L. Brunn de indole, aetate, et usu libri apocr. vulgo inscripti Evangel. Nicodemi. Berol. 1794. 8. Editions are: J. A. Fabricii codex apocryphus N. T. Partes iii. ed. 2. Hamb. 1719. 8. J. C. Thilo codex apocryphus N. T., t. i. Lips. 1832 (containing the apocryphal gospels). [Jones on the canon of the New Testament. Lond. 3 vols. 8vo.] Die apokryph. Evangelien u. Apostelgeschichten, übers. mit Einleit. und Anmerk. v. Dr K. F. Borberg. Stuttgart 1841. Cf. C. J. Nitzsch de apocryphorum Evangeliorum in explicandis canonicis usu et abusu. Viteb., 1808. 4. F. J. Arens de Evangell. apocr. in canonicis usu historico, critico, exegetico. Goetting., 1835. 4.

[4] The first traces of likenesses of Christ are to be found among the Carpocratians (Iren. i. 25), and in the lararium of Severus Alexander (Lamprid., c. 29). The persecuted church of the first centuries needed in Christ the pattern of a sufferer. Hence arose the general opinion that he was of unsightly form, according to Isaiah liii. 2, 3. (So Tertullian de carne Christi 9. adv. Jud. c. 14. and often. Clem. Alex. paedag. iii. 1, strom. ii. p. 308. Origenes contra Cels. vi. p. 327. δυσειδὲς τὸ Ἰησοῦ σῶμα.) At the same time all representations were forbidden, according to Exodus xx. 4. As soon as art began to represent Jesus, it must also have sought to express his excellence even in external form. Hence, from the fourth century onward, Jesus was supposed to have

SECOND CHAPTER.

APOSTOLIC AGE TO THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.

SOURCES: Acts of the Apostles,[1] and Epistles of the New Testament. Scattered notices in the fathers of the first period, collected by Eusebius.[2]

WORKS: Lud. Capelli historia apostolica illustrata Genev., 1634. 4., ed. Jo. A.

had a body of external beauty, something divinely majestic in his exterior, according to Psalm xlv. 3. (Hieron. comm. in Matth. ix. 9.) Yet they confessed still that there was no authentic likeness of Jesus to be seen. (Augustin. de trinitate viii. 4. Nam et ipsius dominicae facies carnis innumerabilium cogitationum diversitate variatur et fingitur, quae tamen una erat, quaecunque erat, and c. 5, qua fuerit ille facie, nos penitus ignoramus.) Eusebius (h. e. vii. c. 18. Comp. the excursus in Heinichen's edition, tom. iii. p. 396 ss.) relates concerning a statue at Paneas that it was there supposed to point to Jesus and the occurrence in Matth. ix. 20. All later writers repeat the story after him, and John Malala (600 A.D.), in his Chronog., p. 305, gave the name of the woman Beronice. This monument was destroyed by Julian (Sozom v. 21. Philostorg. vii. 3), or according to Asterius, bishop of Amasia (about 400 in Photii bibl. cod. 271 in fine), by Maximin at a time when copies of it were hardly taken. Judging by the analogy of many coins, the memorial had been erected in honour of an emperor (probably Hadrian), and falsely interpreted by the Christians, perhaps on account of a σωτῆρι or θεῷ appearing in the inscription (cf. Th. Hasaei diss. ii. de monumento Paneadensi. Bremae, 1726. 4., and in ejusd. sylloge dissertt. ii. 314. Beausobre über die Bildsäule zu Paneas in Cramer's Sammlungen zur Kirchengesch. und theolog. Gelehrsamk. Th. 1. Leipzig, 1748). Later imagines Christi non manu factae (cf. J. Gretser syntagma de imagg. non manu factis. Ingolst., 1622, and appended to Georg. Codinus ed. J. Goar., p. 289. Is. Beausobre des images de main divine, in the Biblioth. Germanique, xviii. 10. Comp. also the controversial writings in the succeeding volumes of that work.) 1. The Θεότευκτος εἰκών, ἣν ἀνθρώπων χεῖρες οὐκ εἰργάσαντο (Evagrius hist. eccl., iv. 27), sent to King Abgarus, and often mentioned in the image controversy, came from Edessa to Constantinople. Rome and Genoa now contend for the honour of its possession. A new miraculous copy of it on a brick was brought by order of the Emperor Nicephorus from Edessa to Constantinople, 968 A.D. Bayer hist. Osrhoëna et Edess., p. 112. Cf. Leo Diaconus (prim. ed. Hase, Paris, 1819), lib. iv. c. 10. 2. Sudarium St Veronicae, still in the middle ages rightly named Veronica, i.e. vera icon. Cf. Gervassi Tilberiensis (about 1210) otia imperialia, c. 25 (Leibnit. scriptt. Brunsv., t. i. p. 968): De figura Domini, quae Veronica dicitur. Est ergo Veronica pictura Domini vera. Matth. Paris ad ann. 1216: effigies vultus Domini, quae Veronica dicitur. Now in Jaen, Milan, and Rome. (Cf. Act. SS. ad d. 4. Febr. Lambertini de servorum Dei beatificatione, lib. iv. p. 2, c. 31.) John VII. (705 A.D.) is said

Fabricius, Lips., 1691. 8. (William Cave's history of the Apostles. London, 1677.) Ph. Jac. Hartmann comm. de rebus gestis Christianorum sub Apos-

to have erected a house of St Maria in Beronica. 3. Sudarium Christi (first mentioned by Bede in lib. de locis sanctis) in Besançon, and the Sindon Christi in Turin. Pretended images of Christ made by his contemporaries: 1. An image of Christ, painted by Luke. Perhaps the first mention of it is by Theodorus Lector (about 518) apud Nicephorum Callistum (about 1333) hist. eccles. ii. 43, who also mentions pictures of Mary and the principal Apostles, painted by Luke, Gregorius? III., in epist. ad Leonem Imp., Simeon Metaphrastes (about 900) in vita S. Lucae. There is a picture of Christ, as a boy of thirteen years of age, by Luke, in the Sancta Sanctorum in the church of St John Lateran at Rome. 2. A picture of Christ, cut out of cedar-wood by Nicodemus, which was before at Berytus, as is pretended (cf. (Pseudo-) Athanasius de passione imaginis D. n. J. Chr. qualiter crucifixa est in Syria in urbe Beryto), appears first in the Acta Synod. Nicaenae ii. (787) sess. iv., was brought to Constantinople by the emperor Nicephorus (Leo Diac. x. c. 5), and is now at Lucca (vultus Lucanus in Gervasius, c. 24, in Leibnitii script. Brunsv., t. i. p. 967). Cf. Joh. Reiskii exercitatt. hist. de imaginibus J. Chr. Jenae, 1685. 4. Jablonski de origine imaginum Christi, in Opuscul. ed. te Water., t. iii. p. 377. (Lugd. Bat., 1809.) F. Münter Sinnbilder und Kunstvorstellungen der alten Christen (2 Hfte. Altona, 1825. 4.) ii., 3. Junker üb. Christusköpfe, in Meusel's Miscellaneen artist. Inhalts. xxv. 28. Ammon über Christusköpfe in his Magazin for christl. Prediger. i., ii., 315.

[5] (J. B. Carpzov) de oris et corporis Jesu Christi forma Pseudolentuli, Joh. Damasceni et Nicephori prosopographiae. Helmstad. 1777. 4. In αὐθεντίαν epistolae P. Lentuli ad Sen. Rom. de Jesu Chr. scriptae denuo inquirit J. Ph. Gabler. Jen., 1819. (Pfingstprogr.) [American Bibl. Repository, 1832.]

[1] For an account of the numerous acts of the Apostles which are found in antiquity, especially among single heretical parties, see the list in Fabricii cod. apocr. Nov. Test., tom. ii. p. 743 ss. Thus the Ebionites had the περίοδοι Πέτρου διὰ Κλήμεντος γραφεῖσαι (Epiphan. haer. xxx. c. 15, comp. below, § 59), and πράξεις ἄλλαι Ἀποστόλων (l. c. c. 16). The Manichaeans, the Actus Apostolorum or τῶν Ἀποστόλων περίοδοι, composed by one Leucius Charinus (Augustin. de fide contra Manich. c. 38, and often. Photii bibl. cod. 114), &c. One of the most modern and copious productions of this kind is the Abdiae (this Abdias, it is pretended, was a disciple of the Apostles, and first bishop of Babylon) historia certaminis apostolici (belonging to the eighth or ninth century), published in Latin in Fabricii cod. apocryph. Nov. Test., t. ii. p. 388 ss. Respecting the apocryphal productions of this kind printed and unprinted, see Thilo acta Thomae in the notitia, p. lii. ss.

[2] Later records are: Synopsis de vita et morte Prophetarum, Apostolorum, et lxx. discipulorum Christi, spuriously ascribed to Dorotheus Tyrius, who lived about 303 (Latin in Bibl. PP. max., tom. iii., Greek fragments in Cave histor. literar., t. i. p. 164 ss., and in the Chronicon paschale ed. du Fresne., p. 426 ss). Hippolytus (not Portuensis, about 230, perhaps Thebanus, about 930) de xii. Apostolis, ubinam quisque

tolis. Berol., 1699. 4. J. Fr. Buddei ecclesia apostolica s. de statu ecclesiae christ. sub Apostolis. Jenae, 1729. 8. (G. Benson's planting of the Christian religion. London, 1756, 4to.) J. J. Hess Geschichte u. Schriften d. Apostel Jesu. 3 Bde. 4te Aufl. Zürich, 1820—22. 8. F. Lücke comm. de eccl. christ. apostolica. Goetting. 1813. 4. Planck's Gesch. d. Christ. u.s.w. See § 20. A. Neander's Gesch. d. Pflanzung u. Leitung der christl. Kirche durch die Apostel. 2 Bde. 3te Aufl. Hamburg, 1841.

G. Ch. R. Matthäi der Religionsglaube der Apostel nach s. Inhalte, Ursprunge u. Werthe. Bd. 1. Gött. 1826. Chr. Fr. Böhme die Religion der Apostel Jesu Christi aus ihren Urkunden dargestellt. Halle, 1829.

§ 25.

EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY TILL THE CONVERSION OF PAUL.

The adherents of Jesus, more than 500 in number, (1 Cor. xv. 6), and among them the twelve disciples, *Simon* (Cephas, Peter), and *Andrew*, sons of Jonas, *James and John*, sons of Zebedee, (Boanerges, sons of thunder, Mark iii. 17),[1] *Philip*, *Thomas* (called Didymus, John xx. 24), *Bartholomew*, (Nathanael? John i. 46), *Matthew*, (Matthew ix. 9, Levi, the son of Alphaeus, Mark ii. 14), *James* (the son of Alphaeus, Matthew x. 3, and of Mary, Matthew xxvii. 56, the wife of Cleopas, John xix. 25),[2] *Thaddeus*, (Lebbaeus surnamed Thaddeus, Matth. x. 3, Jude the brother of James, Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13), *Simon Zelotes* (the Canaanite, Matth. x. 4), and *Matthias*, who was chosen in place of Judas Iscariot, to whom were now added the brethren of Jesus who had become believers,[3] spent the first days after

eorum praedicaverit, et consummatus sit (in Combefisii auctario., t. ii. Paris, 1648.)

[1] According to Wieseler (theol. Studien u. Krit. 1840, iii. 648), the sons of Zebedee were cousins of the Lord, their mother Salome the sister of Mary.

[2] He is generally reckoned the same person with the ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου, Gal. i. 19. Comp. especially Pott prolegg. in epist. Jacobi (ed. iii. 1816), p. 58 ss. Schneckenburger annotatio ad. epist. Jac. (Stuttg., 1832), p. 144. On the other side see Dr C. F. W. Clemen die Brüder Jesu, in Winer's Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. iii. 329. Credner's Einl. in d. N. T. i. ii. 571. Neander's apost. Kirche ii. 422. E. Th. Mayerhoff's Einleit. in d. petrin. Schriften (Hamb., 1835), S. 43. A. H. Blom de τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς et ταῖς ἀδελφαῖς τοῦ κυρίου. Lugd. Bat., 1839. 8. Neudecker's Einl. in d. N. T. S. 656. Wieseler in the theol. Studien u. Krit., 1842, i., 71. Comp. Winer's bibl. Realwörterbuch. i. 620.

[3] Act. i. 14., comp. John vii. 5.

Christ's ascension in retirement in Jerusalem, till the Divine Spirit, who had been in the prophets and in Jesus, began to manifest his living power in them in an extraordinary manner on the day of Pentecost. Furnished with power and courage, the apostles now appeared more publicly, and the number of Christ's confessors increased every day. The community however did not renounce Judaism and the Jewish law, but rather considered themselves to be the society of genuine Israelites, μαθηταί, ἀδελφοί, πιστεύοντες, σωζόμενοι, φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν, called in derision by the Jews *Nazarenes and Galileans*) who having been saved from that untoward generation (Acts ii. 40), were preparing themselves for the unfolding of the Messiah's kingdom in its excellency. It must certainly be admitted, however, that sensuous expectations and erroneous opinions of the near approach of Christ's return (Acts i. 6; iii. 19—21), were mixed up with their better principles.[4] The conditions of reception into this kingdom were repentance and faith in Christ, on which forgiveness of sin was promised in baptism, and the Holy Spirit imparted by the imposition of hands. Though they knew that the heathen also were admitted into the kingdom of God, still more that they should be invited, they yet believed that these Gentiles should first be incorporated among the Jewish people as *proselytes of righteousness*, and necessarily observe the entire Mosaic law. With this opinion they could not be in haste to invite the heathen also to embrace Christianity.

But although the community did not separate itself from the religion of the Jews, yet they were more closely connected together by the peculiar direction which their religious feelings naturally took, and by their peculiar hopes. Thus there arose by degrees a regularly constituted society among the brethren. For this the Jewish synagogue presented itself as the most natural model.[5] At first, the apostles themselves performed the duties of the society, but by degrees special officers were appointed. The apostles caused seven *distributors of alms* to be chosen (Acts vi. 1—6),[6] inasmuch as the brethren showed very great

[4] Chr. Fr. Boehme de spe Messiana apostolica. Halae, 1826. 8.

[5] The chief work is: Campeg. Vitringa de synagoga vetere, lib. iii., quibus tum de synagogis agitur, tum praecipue formam regiminis et ministerii earum in ecclesiam christ. translatam esse demonstratur. Franequerae, 1696, and Leucopetr., 1726. 4.

[6] Luke calls them simply the seven (οἱ ἑπτά), Act. xxi. 8. In later

liberality towards their poor,[7] and because the administration of these gifts threatened to be detrimental to the proper calling and ministry of the twelve. Soon after this, we find πρεσβύτερος, elders, (Acts xi. 30=זְקֵנִים,) chosen not so much for the purpose of teaching, as for the management of common concerns, and for maintaining the ordinances of the church. In all these appointments of the society, the apostles did not act despotically, but allowed the church to determine them, (Acts vi. 2; xv. 22, 23).

The bold appearance of the apostles, and the enlargement of their party, soon excited attention. The *Sadducees* were now the bitterest enemies of those who confessed the name of one risen from the dead, (Acts iv. 2; v. 17; xxiii. 6). On the other hand, *priests* (Acts vi. 7) and *Pharisees* (xv. 5) joined the Christians. After threatenings had been used with the apostles in vain, (Acts iv.), the Sadducean party in the Sanhedrim wished to apply violent measures, (v. 17 ff.), but were restrained by the prudent counsel of the Pharisee Gamaliel, (v. 34 ff., comp. xxiii. 6). Some Hellenists, however, provoked by the zeal of Stephen, stirred up the popular fury, to which the San-

times they have for the most part been regarded as the first deacons. So Cyprian, as early as his time; epist. 65 ad Rogatianum. They are, however, distinguished from the deacons by Chrysostom hom. 14 in Acta § 3 (ed. Montfaucon. ix. 115), and the council of Trulla, canon 16. Vitringa de syn. vet. lib. iii. p. ii. cap. 5., compares them with the גַּבַּאִים of the synagogue; and, on the other hand, the διακόνοι of Paul with the חַזָּנִים. Boehmer, diss. jur. eccl. ant. diss. vii. p. 377, actually looked upon them as the first presbyters. See on the other side Mosheim de rebus Christ. ante Const. p. 122. Without doubt the deacons arose from the seven by an enlargement of the circle of duties required. See Mosheim l. c. p. 120. Neander's apost. Kirche, i. 142. R. Rothe's Anfänge d. christl. Kirche. i. 162. Another opinion of Vitringa (l. c.), supported by Mosheim (l. c. p. 118), is, that those seven were appointed for the Hellenist poor. But the Grecian names do not necessarily indicate Hellenists; comp. the names of the apostles Andrew and Philip. Perhaps three were Hebrew, three Hellenistic Jews, and one a proselyte.

[7] The opinion that the kingdom of Messiah should soon appear contributed, doubtless, very much to promote this liberality (comp. Matth. xxv. 34 ff.) It is not a community of goods that is taught in Acts ii. 44, 45; iv. 33—35; but a spontaneous arrangement of property, according to the precept in Luke xii. 33. Cf. Mosheim de vera natura communionis bonorum in eccl. Hierosol. in his dissertatt. ad hist. eccles. pertinentium ii., i. Ananias's crime was a mean calculation, and withal a selfishness that assumed the appearance of enthusiastic brotherly love.

hedrim soon gave way. Stephen fell as the first martyr, (vi. 8—vii. 60); but the very persecution that now set in was the first means of spreading Christianity still farther. The Christians, driven from Jerusalem, preached the gospel in Judea, Samaria, (viii. 1—4), even as far as Damascus, (ix. 10, 19), Phœnicia, Cyprus, and Antioch, but yet only to the Jews, (xi. 19). In the mean time, they had cast off the Pharisaic prejudice against the Samaritans; and in Samaria itself *Philip* gained many converts to Christianity. The same individual preached the gospel in the towns on the sea-coast of Palestine, and finally took up his abode in Caesarea, probably as the founder of a church there, (viii. 40, comp. xxi. 8). The apostles, who had hitherto remained always in Jerusalem, now sent Peter and John to Samaria, in order to carry on the work there begun, (viii. 14 ff.) Peter then went to the towns on the sea-coast, where he was commanded by Heaven to baptize a pious proselyte of the gate, the centurion Cornelius, in Caesarea, (Acts x.) He quieted, indeed, the believers in Jerusalem who were not pleased with this transaction, (xi. 1—18); but the greatest part of them did not proceed farther than to allow that the heathen should be baptized rather than circumcised. In this sense alone the church at Jerusalem approved of the conduct of some Hellenistic Jews in Antioch who had converted even Gentiles to Christianity, (xi. 20, comp. ver. 22). They still maintained the view, that the Mosaic law was absolutely binding on all nations,[8] which was held particularly by some believing Pharisees, (xv. 5), regarding the universal and strict observance of that law as an essential characteristic of the times of Messiah, (according to Isaiah lii. 1, lxvi. 17, 20; Zech. viii. 21—23, xiv. 16, &c.)

§ 26.

PAUL.

W. Paley's Horae Paulinæ. Translated into German, from the English, by Henke. Helmstadt 1797, 8vo. J. T. Hemsen der Apostel Paulus, herausgeg. v. Lücke. Göttingen 1830. 8. K. Schrader der Apostel Paulus. 3 Thle. Leipzig 1850 f. 8. (Chronology, history, creed). Winer's bibl. Realwörterbuch. ii. 245.

[8] Above, § 17, not. 8. My treatise respecting the Nazarenes and Ebionites in Staüdlin's u. Tzschirner's Archiv. f. KG. iv., 2, 308.

On the chronology see J. Pearson annales Paulini (prefixed to his Opp. posthumis chronol. Lond. 1688. 4). Keil de definiendo tempore itineris Pauli Hierosolymitani Gal. ii. 1, 2, commemorati. 1798 (also in Keilii opuscul. academ. ed. J. D. Goldhorn. i. 160). See Versuch chronolog. Standpunkte in der Lebensgesch. Pauli (in Gabler's theol. Journ. i. ii. 243), Süskind Versuch chronol. Standpunkte für die Apostelgesch. u. f. d. Leben Jesu (in Bengel's Archiv. für d. Theol. i. 156 ff. 297 ff) J. E. C. Schmidt Chronologie d. Apostelgeschichte (in Keil and Tzschirner's Analecten. iii. i. 128). On the other side, Keil über die Zeit, in welcher der Brief an die Galater geschrieben ist (Analecten iii. ii. 55, and in Latin in Keilii opusculis, i. 351). C. G. Küchler de anno quo Paulus Apost. ad sacra christ. conversus est. Lips. 1828. 8. H. A. Schott's Erörterung einiger wichtiger chronolog. Punkte in d. Lebensgesch. d. Ap. Paulus. Jena 1832. 8. R. Anger de temporum in actis App. ratione. Lips. 1833. 8. J. F. Wurm über die Zeitbestimmungen im Leben d. Ap. Paulus, in the Tübingen Zeitschrift f. Theol. 1833, i. 3.

In the mean time, however, that man had been previously converted to Christianity, to whom the mystery was to be announced that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs of the promises, (Ephes. iii. 3—6). *Saul*, born at *Tarsus* in Cilicia, and a Roman citizen,[1] but educated in Jerusalem under Gamaliel, a Pharisee, from being a dangerous enemy of Christianity suddenly became a zealous adherent to it, (37—40 A.D.) After a three years' abode in Damascus and Arabia he came to Jerusalem, where *Barnabas*[2] introduced him to the apostles Peter and James, (Gal. i. 17—19; Acts ix. 19—27). The very same person conducted him also to the great scene of his apostolic labours; for, having been sent by the apostles to Antioch in order to establish the infant church there, he recalled Paul from Tarsus, and took him as his assistant, (Acts xi. 22—26). After this, when *Herod Agrippa* (41—44), for the purpose of ingratiating himself with the people, persecuted the church at Jerusalem, when James the elder was put to death, and Peter was saved from a like fate only by a miracle, (Acts xii.), Jerusalem ceased to be the secure seat of the apostles;[3] and *James*, the

[1] On the rights of Roman citizenship, see Winer's bibl. Realwörterbuch. i., 235.

[2] Gu. H. Haverkorn van Rysewyk diss. de Barnaba. Arnhemiae, 1835. 8.

[3] With this agrees Apollonius (about 190), who (Euseb. h. e. v., 18) ὡς ἐκ παραδόσεως τὸν σωτῆρά φησι προστεταχέναι τοῖς αὐτοῦ ἀποστόλοις ἐπὶ δώδεκα ἔτεσι μὴ χωρισθῆναι τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ. So also the Κήρυγμα Πέτρου in Clem. Alex. strom. vi. 762. Comp. Credner's Beiträge zur Einl. in die bibl. Schriften. i. 353, 363.

brother of the Lord, and a Nazarite, appeared at the head of the church with a reputation equal to that of an apostle.[4] In the mean time, Barnabas and Saul at Antioch gathered from among Jews and Gentiles a church so numerous, even in wealthy members, (χρισταινοί, Acts ii. 26),[5] that they were able to bring contributions thence to the brethren at Jerusalem when a famine occurred, (44 A.D., Acts ii. 27—30; xii. 25). After this, the two

[4] Hegesippus in Euseb. h. e. ii., 23: Διαδέχεται τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου Ἰάκωβος, ὁ ὀνομασθεὶς ὑπὸ πάντων δίκαιος. —Οὗτος δὲ ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ ἅγιος ἦν. Οἶνον καὶ σίκερα οὐκ ἔπιεν, οὐδὲ ἔμψυχον ἔφαγε· ξυρὸν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἀνέβη· ἔλαιον οὐκ ἠλείψατο, καὶ βαλανείῳ οὐκ ἐχρήσατο. Τούτῳ μόνῳ ἐξῆν εἰς τὰ ἅγια εἰσιέναι· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐρεοῦν ἐφόρει, ἀλλὰ σινδόνας. Καὶ μόνος εἰσήρχετο εἰς τὸν ναὸν, ηὑρίσκετό τε κείμενος ἐπὶ τοῖς γόνασι, καὶ αἰτούμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ ἄφεσιν, ὡς ἀπεσκληκέναι τὰ γόνατα αὐτοῦ δίκην καμήλου, διὰ τὸ ἀεὶ κάμπτειν ἐπὶ γόνυ προσκυνοῦντα τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ αἰτεῖσθαι ἄφεσιν τῷ λαῷ. Διά γέ τοι τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ ἐκαλεῖτο Δίκαιος, καὶ Ὠβλίας, ὅ ἐστιν ἑλληνιστὶ περιοχὴ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ δικαιοσύνη, ὡς οἱ προφῆται δηλοῦσι περὶ αὐτοῦ. (Ὠβλίας עָם עֹפֶל according to Reines. var. lect. lib. iii. On the other hand, Fuller misc. sacr. lib. iii., Ὠζλίαμ וְעֹז לְעַם after Ps. xxix. 11. Comp. Routh reliq. sacr. i., 214. Heinichen ad h. l. Kimmel de Rufino., p. 278.) Here the principles of the Essenes are mixed with the Nazarite, doubtless in the traditional account of the later Ebionites, who fathered their asceticism upon James. Clement of Alexandria related, in the sixth book of his Hypotyposes (Euseb. ii. 1), Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν τοῦ σωτῆρος, ὡς ἂν καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου προτετιμημένους, μὴ ἐπιδικάζεσθαι δόξης, ἀλλ' Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον ἐπίσκοπον Ἱεροσολύμων ἑλέσθαι. The three apostles selected are also those named in Matth. xvii. 1, 26, 37: consequently the James specified is the son of Zebedee. It has been disputed whether the person chosen, the same who appears at the head of the church in Jerusalem (Acts xii. 17; xv. 13; xxi. 18; Gal. i. 19; ii. 9), was the son of Alphaeus, or the brother of the Lord, or both (comp. § 25, note 2). Hegesippus manifestly points out the brother of the Lord, different from the apostle. So also the Apost. Constit. ii. 55; vi. 12. In vi. 14, they give a list of the twelve apostles, and then put in equal rank with them: Ἰάκωβός τε ὁ τοῦ κυρίου ἀδελφὸς καὶ Ἱεροσολύμων ἐπίσκοπος, καὶ Παῦλος ὁ τῶν ἐθνῶν διδασκαλος; a testimony which deserves consideration as belonging to the third century and to Syria. It need not appear remarkable that James the son of Alphaeus, as well as most of the apostles, should disappear from the record of the New Testament, and that Luke and Paul did not consider it necessary to separate from him and to characterise particularly the James who is conspicuous in all Christendom.

[5] This was probably at first a name of derision in the mouth of the inhabitants of Antioch, who were famous for their wit (Lucian. de saltat., c. 76: οἱ γὰρ Ἀντιοχεῖς εὐφυεστάτη πόλις. Julianus misopog., p. 314. Ammian. Marcell. xxii. 14. Zosimus iv. p. 258. Procop. Pers. ii. 8).

entered on the first large missionary journey through *Cyprus*, *Pamphylia*, *Pisidia*, *Lycaonia*, during which the gospel was preached to Jews and Gentiles. After they had again abode for a long time in Antioch, Hebrew Christians came thither who excited divisions in the church, by the assertion, that the newly converted Gentile Christians must also necessarily become Jewish *proselytes of righteousness*. Hence Paul and Barnabas were sent to Jerusalem, where they received from the collective apostles, and the assembled church, a decision to the effect, that the Gentiles should only be required to accede to proselytism of the gate, (Acts xv.)[6] They were also, at the same time, recognised as *apostles of the Gentiles* by Peter, James, and John, who resolved to continue their labours among

[6] The injunctions in Acts xv. 29 are the so-called precepts of Noah. See above § 17, note 8. So Origen in comment. ad epist. ad Rom. lib. ii. (ad Rom. ii. 26, ed. Lommatzsch., p. 128): Vides ergo (out of Levit. xvii. 10—12), hanc de observatione sanguinis legem, quae communiter et filiis Israel et advenis data est, observari etiam a nobis, qui ex gentibus per Jesum Christum credimus Deo. Nos enim proselytos et advenas Scriptura nominare consuevit: cum dicit (Deut. xxviii. 43): Advena, qui est in te, ascendet super te sursum; tu autem descendes deorsum. Ipse erit tibi caput, tu autem eris ejus cauda. Ideo ergo legem de observatione sanguinis communem cum filiis Israel etiam gentium suscepit ecclesia. Haec namque ita intelligens in lege scripta, tunc beatum illud Apostolorum Concilium decernebat, dogmata et decreta gentibus scribens, ut abstinerent se non solum ab his, quae idolis immolantur, et a fornicatione, sed et a sanguine et a suffocato. Tertull. de monogam., c. 5: in Christo omnia revocantur ad initium—et libertas ciborum et sanguinis solius abstinentia, sicut ab initio fuit. Initium tibi et in Adam censetur, et in Noe recensetur. Constitt. apost. vi. 12, says of those prohibitions: ἅπερ καὶ τοῖς πάλαι νενομοθέτητο τοῖς πρὸ τοῦ νόμου φυσικοῖς Ἐνῶς, Ἐνὼχ, Νῶε κ. τ. λ. My treatise respecting the Nazarenes and Ebionites in Stäudlin's u. Tzschirner's Archiv f. KG. iv., ii., 309. This explanation is also given by W. Schickard de jure regio Ebraeorum (Argentor., 1625), cap. 5, p. 129. Hammond and Alex. Morus ad Act. xv. 20. Sandius in nucleo hist. eccl., p. 54. It is otherwise explained by Spencer de legibus Hebr. ritualibus ed. Pfaff., p. 595 ss. Nitzsch de sensu decreti apostolici Act. xv. 29, Viteb., 1795 (also in Commentatt. theol. ed. a Velthusen, Ruperti et Kuinoel. vi. 403). Nösselt diss. de vera vi et ratione decreti Hierosolymitani Act. xv. (in ejusd. exercitatt. ad. sacr. script. interpret., p. 95.) When many writers assume that the abstaining from flesh offered in sacrifice to idols, from blood and things strangled, was enjoined on the Gentile Christians, because the Jews held these things in greatest abhorrence, it should be remarked that this greater abhorrence of them had its foundation in the circumstance of those things being forbidden of God, according to the Jewish opinion, not merely to the Jews but to all men.

the Jews, (Gal. ii. 9, A.D. 52). Soon after, Barnabas and Mark made *a second journey* to Cyprus, while Paul and Silas repaired to the churches of Asia Minor. In Lystra, Paul took Timothy with him, travelled through *Phrygia* and *Galatia*, passed over into *Macedonia*, where churches had been founded at Philippi, Thessalonica, and Berœa, and came by Athens to *Corinth*, (*Epistles to the Thessalonians*).[7] After remaining there a yaer and a half, he returned by Ephesus, Caesarea, and Jerusalem, to Antioch, (Acts xv. 36—xviii. 22). But he soon entered on the *third great journey* to Asia Minor, where he passed at *Ephesus* the first two years and three months. Here, and in the vicinity, he established Christianity more firmly, (*Epistle to the Galatians? First Epistle to the Corinthians*), and then travelled through *Macedonia* (*Second Epistle to Corinthians*) to *Corinth* (*Epistle to the Romans*). After a three months abode in this city, he returned to Jerusalem by Miletus, (Acts xviii. 23; xxi. 17). Here, having been taken in the temple, (58 A.D.), he was brought to Caesarea, and thence to Rome, (60—61 A.D., epistles to the *Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians*, and to *Philemon*). The Acts of the Apostles closes with the second year of the Roman captivity, (63 A.D.); but according to later, though ancient testimonies, he was again liberated from this bondage, made several other journeys, (*First Epistle to Timothy*,[8] *Epistle to Titus*), and then fell into a second captivity at Rome, (*Second Epistle to Timothy*), which terminated in his death, (67 A.D.)[9]

[7] The conduct of Gallio, the brother of Seneca, towards Paul, Acts xviii. 12, and Phil. iv. 22, gave rise to the subsequent fabrication of a correspondence between Seneca and Paul. Hieron. Catal., c. 12. Fabric. cod. apocr. N. T. T. ii. p. 880 ss. Cf. Gelpke tract. de familiaritate, quae Paulo Apost. cum Seneca philosopho intercessisse traditur, verisimillima. Lips. 1813.

[8] So according to Ussher, Mill, Pearson, Le Clerc, and Paley: Heydenreich die Pastoralbriefe Pauli. Bd. 1. (Hadamar, 1826). S. 36 ff. G. Böhl über die Zeit der Abfassung u. d. Paulin. Charakter der Briefe an Timoth. u. Titus. Berlin, 1829. S. 204 ff. If the pastoral letters had been a forgery of the second century, as Baur thinks (die Sogen. Pastoralbriefe d. Ap. Paulus. Stutt. and Tüb. 1835), it would be an inexplicable thing that the writer should lay at the basis of the history certain situations in which the apostle was placed, which cannot be pointed out in the New Testament.

[9] So Eusebius h. e. ii. c. 22, supported by Clemens Rom. Ep. i. § 5: Διὰ ζῆλον ὁ Παῦλος ὑπομονῆς βραβεῖον ἄπεσχεν—. Κήρυξ γενόμενος ἔν τε τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ δύσει, τὸ γενναῖον τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ κλέος ἔλαβεν. Δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθών, καὶ μαρ-

Among Paul's disciples the most distinguished were *Silas*, or *Silvanus* (Acts xv. 40 ss., as far as xviii. 5; 2 Cor. i. 19), who was afterward with Peter, (1 Peter v. 12); *Timothy*, who, commissioned by Paul, abode for a long time at Ephesus, in order to arrange the affairs of the church at that place; *Titus*, who had been left for the same purpose in Crete (both considered in later times as the first bishops of these churches, *Euseb.* iii. 4); and *Luke*.

§ 27.

HISTORY OF THE OTHER APOSTLES AND THEIR DISCIPLES.

J. A. Fabricii salutaris lux evangelii toti orbi exoriens, (Hamburg 1731, 4to,) page 95 ss.

The history of the other apostles, and their early pupils, is involved in great obscurity, and has frequently been much disfigured by mistakes and fabrications. Among these distortions may be reckoned principally, the traditions respecting the apostles determining by lots to what countries they should go from Jerusalem,[1] the joint composition of the *apostles' creed*,[2]

τυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων, οὕτως ἀπηλλάγη τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ εἰς τὸν ἅγιον τόπον ἐπορεύθη. Even the fragmentum de canone in Muratorii antiquitt. ital. medii aevi iii. 854, which belongs to the third century, mentions the departure of Paul setting out from the city for Spain. A single captivity of Paul in Rome, ending with his death, is assumed by Petavius, Lardner, J. E. C. Schmidt, Eichhorn, E. F. R. Wolf (de altera Pauli Ap. captivitate diss. ii., Lips., 1819. 20. 8.), Schrader (Paulus i. 227), Hemsen, Baur, Reuss (Gesch. d. Schriften d. N. T., § 54), Matthiä (Pastoralbr. S. 185, 593), de Wette (Einl. in d. N. T., § 122), Schenkel (theol. Studien u. Krit., 1841, i. 53). On the contrary, the older view is defended by P. E. Jablonski diss. de ultimis Pauli Ap. laboribus a Luca praetermissis (Opusc. ed. J. G. te Water. iii. 289), J. P. Mynster de ultimis annis muneris apostolici a Paulo gesti (kleine theol. Schriften. Kopenhagen, 1825. S. 189), Heydenreich (Pastoralbriefe ii. 6), Böhl (a. a. O. S. 81), Wurm (Tübing. Zeitschr. f. Theol. 1833, i. 81), Schott (Erörterung einiger chronol. Punkte in d. Lebensgesch. d. Ap. Paulus. S. 116), Neander (apost. Kirche i. 389), Credner (Einl. in d. N. T. i. i. 317), Neudecker (Einl. in d. N. T. S. 397).

[1] First advanced by Rufinus in hist. eccl., i. 9. Cf. Acta SS. ad d. 15, Jul. Thilo acta Thomae., p. 87 ss.

[2] First advanced by Rufinus in exposit. symboli apostolici. A homily de symbolo, falsely ascribed to Augustine, gives a still more particular account. Cf. Fabricii cod. apocr. N. T. vol. iii. p. 339 ss. The story

and their unmarried state,[3] as well as the tradition that they all suffered martyrdom except John.[4] And when the apostles, who continued a long time in single churches, were considered as the first bishops of them, the fact was liable to be misunderstood. *Peter* was still found in Jerusalem in the year 52, (Acts xv.), then in *Antioch*, (Gal. ii. 11), also in *Babylon*, (1 Peter v. 13), and, according to other ancient testimonies, he suffered martyrdom in Rome, (67 A.D.)[5] Since the end of the 4th century, the

is defended by Natalis Alex. hist. eccl. saec. i. diss. xii.; Acta SS. ad. d. 15, Jul. u. J. Chrys. Trombellius tract. de sacramentis. Bonon., 1770. T. ii., diss. 4, qu. 3. On the contrary, Du Pin and Tillemont, with all Protestant theologians, acknowledge the fiction.

[3] Comp. against this 1 Cor. ix. 5. Hence also Ignatius ad Philadelph., c. 4., mentions Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου—καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀποστόλων τοῖς γάμοις προσομιλησάντων. Clem. Alex. strom. iii., p. 448: Πέτρος καὶ Φίλιππος ἐπαιδοποιήσαντο· καὶ Παῦλος οὐκ ὀκνεῖ ἔν τινι ἐπιστολῇ τὴν αὐτοῦ προσαγορεύειν σύζυγον, ἣν οὐ περιεκόμιζεν διὰ τὸ τῆς ὑπηρεσίας εὐσταλές. See J. A. Theiner and A. Theiner die Einführung der erzwungenen Ehelosigkeit bei den christl. Geistlichen und ihre Folgen (Altenburg, 1828. 2 Bde. 8). Bd. 1. S. 26. On the other hand, the Montanist Tertullianus de monogam., c. 8: Petrum solum invenio maritum; caeteros cum maritos non invenio, aut spadones intelligam necesse est aut continentes. Nec enim—Paulum sic interpretabimur, quasi demonstret uxores apostolos habuisse. In later times, 1 Cor. ix. 5, was explained of female friends who served: Ambrosiaster ad h. l. Hieronymus ad Matth. xxvii. 55. Theodoret. ad 1 Cor. ix. 5, who adds, however, τινὲς οὕτως ἡρμήνευσαν. (Cf. Suiceri thesaur. ecclesiasticus ed. ii. Amstel., 1728. T. i. p. 810, s. v. γυνή.) Even when it was conceded, as by Ambrosiaster ad 2 Cor. xi. 2: Omnes apostoli, exceptis Johanne et Paulo, uxores habuerunt: the view was usually held, Hieron. epist. 30 (al. 50) ad Pammachium (ed. Martianay, t. iv. p. ii. p. 242): Apostoli vel virgines, vel post nuptias continentes. On the whole subject, see G. Calixtus de conjugio Clericorum (ed. ii. ed. H. Ph. C. Henke. Helmst., 1783). P. ii., p. 147 ss.

[4] Heracleon (ap. Clem. Alex. strom. iv. p. 502) says that Matthew, Philip, Thomas, and Levi (Thaddeus?), did not suffer martyrdom.

[5] Clemens Rom. epist. i. c. 5, testifies merely to his martyrdom; Ignatius ep. ad Rom., cap. 4, alludes to it. The Praedicatio Petri (which was known even to Heracleon, and consequently belongs to the beginning of the second century; see the Clementines by A. Schliemann. Hamb. 1844, P. 253), comp. Lib. de non iterando bapt. appended to Cypriani opp. ed. Rigalt. p. 139: liber, qui inscribitur Pauli praedicatio, in quo libro—invenies, post tanta tempora Petrum et Paulum, post conlationem evangelii in Hierusalem et mutuam altercationem et rerum agendarum dispositionem, postremo in urbe, quasi tunc primum, invicem sibi esse cognitos. (The praedicatio Pauli seems to have formed the last part of the Praed. Petri. Credner's Beiträge zur Einleit. in die bibl. Schriften i. 360.) Dionysius Corinth. (about 170) Ep. ad Romanos (in Euseb. ii. 25): Ἀμφω (Πέτρος καὶ Παῦ-

fabrication of the Clementines, that Peter was first bishop of Antioch, and then of Rome, obtained more general currency.[6]

λος) καὶ εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν Κόρινθον φυτεύσαντες ἡμᾶς, ὁμοίως ἐδίδαξαν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν ὁμόσε διδάξαντες, ἐμαρτύρησαν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρόν. Irenaeus adv. haer. (written 176 or 177) iii. 1. Ὁ μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν καὶ γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου, τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων, καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον Μάρκος κ. τ. λ. Tertullianus de praescr. haereticorum c. 36: Felix ecclesia (Romana), cui totam doctrinam Apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt; ubi Petrus passioni dominicae adaequatur, ubi Paulus Johannis (baptistae) exitu coronatur. Cajus Romanus (about 200) in Euseb. ii. 25: Ἐγὼ δὲ τὰ τρόπαια τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἔχω δεῖξαι· ἐὰν γὰρ θελήσῃς ἀπελθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸν Βατικανὸν, ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν Ὀστίαν, εὑρήσεις τὰ τρόπαια τῶν ταύτην ἱδρυσαμένων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. In the middle ages the Waldenses denied (Moneta adv. Catharos et Waldenses, Romae 1743, fol. p. 411) Marsilius Patavinus, Michael Caesenas, &c. (cf. Spanheim de ficta profectione Petri Ap. in urbem Romam, Opp. ii. 337) that Peter had ever been at Rome. In this they were followed by Matth. Flacius, Claud. Salmasius, and Fred. Spanheim (l. c.), all obviously entangled by party feeling. Several moderns, resting on a scientific basis, have made the same assertion, particularly Eichhorn (Einl. in d. N. T. i. 554), Baur (Tübinger theol. Zeitschr. 1831. iv. 136. 1836. iii. 163) and Mayerhoff (Einl. in die Petrin. Schriften, Hamburg 1835. S. 73). Neander (apost. Kirche ii. 458) and Winer (bibl. Realwörterbuch ii. 281) waver. On the contrary, the old tradition is defended by Credner (Einleit. in d. N. T. i. ii. 628. Hall. A. L. Z. 1836, July. S. 370), Bleek (theol. Studien. und Krit. 1836. iv. 1061) and Olshausen (Einleit. zum Römerbriefe and theol. Stud. und Kritik. 1838, iv. 916). There is a new rejoinder by Baur (über den Ursprung des Episcopates, s. 43). A violent catholic defence is presented in Frid. Windischmanni vindiciae Petrinae. Ratisb. 1836. If, according to Baur, this tradition proceeded from Judaising Christians at Rome for the purpose of exalting Peter above Paul, we cannot understand how the fabrication did not forthwith meet with a decided contradiction from the adherents of Paul at Rome, nor how Caius, a disciple of Paul, is a leading witness for its truth. Comp. Drey, Herbst, and Hirscher theol. Quartalschrift. Tübingen 1820, iv. 567. Mynster's Kleine theol. Schriften, Kopenhag. 1825, s. 141. On the manner of Christ's death Tertullian speaks: (l. c.) Petrus passioni dominicae adaequatur. On the other hand, Origen (in Euseb. h. e. iii. c. 1): Πέτρος—ἀνεσκολοπίσθη κατὰ κεφαλῆς, οὕτως ἀξιώσας παθεῖν, according to Rufinus' version: crucifixus est deorsum capite demerso, quod ipse ita fieri deprecatus est, ne exaequari Domino videretur.

[6] Die Clementinen von A. Schliemann. Hamburg 1844, s. 115. Eusebius iii. 2, says: μετὰ τὴν Παύλου καὶ Πέτρου μαρτυρίαν πρῶτος κληροῦται τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν Λῖνος, and according to him, iii. 4, Clement is τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας τρίτος ἐπίσκοπος καταστάς (Linus, Anacletus, Clemens). Rufini praef. in recognitiones Clementis: Linus et Cletus fuerunt quidem ante Clementem episcopi in urbe Roma, sed superstite Petro, vide-

Philip spent the last years of his life in Hierapolis in Phrygia, (*Polycrates* about 190 *ap. Euseb.* l. c. iii. 31, and v. 24). *John* also went to Asia Minor, but a great part of his life belongs to the following period. The traditions are ancient respecting *Thomas* preaching the gospel in Parthia,[7] *Andrew* in Scythia, (*Origenes ap. Euseb.* iii. 1), *Bartholomew* in India,[8] (*Euseb.* v. 10), and it is reported that *John Mark*, first the companion of Paul and Barnabas, then of Peter, was the founder of the church in Alexandria, (*Euseb.* ii. 16). The later traditions respecting the apostles, and apostolic men, which have been partly indebted for their origin to the wish of many nations to trace their Christianity up to the apostolic age, are, to say the least, uncertain, and in part so marvellously forged, that they sufficiently prove their own falseness.[9]

licet ut illi episcopatus curam gererent, ipse vero apostolatus impleret officium. Epiphanius also has the correct opinion respecting the episcopate of the apostles, haer. xxvii. 6: ἐν Ῥώμῃ γὰρ γεγόνασι πρῶτοι Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος οἱ Ἀπόστολοι αὐτοὶ καὶ Ἐπίσκοποι.—Peter is named the first bishop of Antioch, first of all by Chrysostom. hom. xlii. in Ignat. Mart. Hieronymus catal. c. 1, and Comm. in ep. ad Gal. c. 1, the first bishop of Rome by Optatus Milev. de schism. Donatist. ii. 2. Hieron. catal. c. 1. Augustin. ep. liii. ad Generosum and contra lit. Petilian iii. Jerome was the first that knew that he had been twenty-five years bishop of Rome. The tradition of the modern Roman church is most fully developed in Gregor. Cortesii de Romano itinere gestisque principis Apostolorum libri. ii. Vinc. Al. Constantius recensuit, notis illustravit, annales ss. Petri et Pauli et appendicem monumentorum adjecit. Rom. 1770. 8.

7 Later accounts make Thomas go to India. So first Gregor. Nazianz. orat. xxv. ad Arian. p. 438. ed. Paris. Ambrosius in Psalm xlv. 10. Hieronym. epist. 148, and so the Syrian Christians in India (Thomas-Christians) consider him to be the founder of their church (Assemani bibl. orient. iii. ii. 435), comp. Acta Thomae apostoli ed. J. C. Thilo. Lips. 1823, p. 97, 121. These Manichaean Acta Thomae render it probable that the tradition is of Manichaean origin. On this account Theodoret haer. fab. i. c. 26, declares that the Thomas sent to the Indians was a disciple of Manes.

8 Probably Yemen. Rufinus h. e. x 9: Thomae Parthia, et Matthaeo Aethiopia, eique adhaerens exterior India Bartholomaeo dicitur sorte decreta. Inter quam Parthiamque Media, sed longo interior tractu India ulterior jacet So also Philostorgius h. e. ii. 6, calls the Sabaeans, or Homerites, τοὺς ἐνδοτάτω Ἰνδους.

9 Thus the Spaniards pretend that James the elder was seen in their country, (his body is said to be in Compostella since A.D. 816); the French claim Dionysius the Areopagite, Lazarus, Mary Magdalene, and others; the English, Simon Zelotes, and especially Joseph of Arimathea;

§ 28.

RECEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY AMONG JEWS AND GENTILES.

(Comp. § 19.)

Neander's Kirchengesch. 2te. Auflage i. i. 117 ff.

With the Jews, their earthly expectations of the Messiah always presented a special obstacle to Christianity. When the Christians not only took into their society the Samaritans, but when Paul admitted the very heathen into it, without requiring of them circumcision, the fact appeared to the Jews to afford sufficient proof that the confessors of Christ could not be followers of a true Messiah; and Christianity now appeared to them only a form of Judaism profaned by a mutilated impartation of it to the heathen, as is expressed even in the appellation of the Christians, נוֹצְרִים, which originated, perhaps, somewhat later. On this account Paul and his disciples were most violently hated by the Palestinian Jews, (Gal. v. 11, Rom. xv. 31), who could even spread the report concerning him, that he had introduced heathen into the temple, the uproar arising from which caused his imprisonment, (Acts xxi. 27 ff.) Among the Hellenistic Jews Paul found once and again much susceptibility of mind in relation to Christianity, as in *Berea*, (Acts xvii. 11, 12), *Ephesus* (xviii. 19, 20), and *Rome* (xxviii. 17). In other places these very Jews were his most dangerous enemies, as in *Thessalonica* (xvii. 5 ff.), and *Corinth* (xviii. 12 ff.), partly from the usual national prejudice, and partly also, perhaps, from fear lest the publication of their Messianic hopes might injure them in the eyes of the Romans, (Acts xvii. 6—8).

In addition to the inward power of Christian truth on the human spirit, the miraculous origin of Christianity and the prevailing inclination to foreign superstitions, influenced the heathen in its favour. On the contrary, with the higher classes, and especially the philosophers, (1 Cor. i. 18 ff.), its Jewish

the Germans, Maternus, Eucherius, and Valerius, as legates of Peter; the Russians, Andrew, &c. The real but later founders of churches have been frequently transferred to the times of the apostles by tradition.

origin, the simple form in which it appeared (Acts xvii. 18 ff.), and the doctrine of the resurrection of the body (l. c. 32) hindered its reception. Christianity was looked upon at this time by the heathen only as a Jewish sect,[1] an opinion which from many indeed may have drawn upon it contempt, but which secured for it, notwithstanding, the protection of the civil government (Acts xviii. 12 ff.); for now, the Christian societies, like the Jewish, passed for *Sodalitia licita* (comp. § 12). The circumstance, that even some heathens were drawn away from their own religion by means of these communities, served indeed to raise complaints against them (Acts xvi. 20 ff. xvii. 18); these, however, were generally overlooked by the Roman magistrates, just as the circumstance of many heathens becoming *proselytes of the gate* had been formerly passed over, since amid the general inclination to foreign superstitions,[2] the old religious laws were not strictly enforced. When *Claudius*, on account of a dispute between the believing and unbelieving Jews at Rome, expelled both parties from the city, this act cannot naturally be reckoned a persecution of the Christians.[3] As little were the Christians

[1] J. G. Kraft proluss. ii. de nascenti Christi ecclesia sectae judaicae nomine tuta. Erlang. 1771. 72.—J. H. Ph. Seidenstücker diss. de Christianis ad Trajanum usque a Caesaribus et Senatu Romano pro cultoribus religionis Mosaicae semper habitis. Helmst., 1790.

[2] When Tertullian relates that Tiberius wished Christ to be admitted among the Roman deities (Apologeticus, c. 5: detulit ad Senatum cum praerogativa suffragii sui. Senatus quia non ipse probaverat, respuit. Caesar in sententia mansit comminatus periculum accusatoribus Christianorum), this is in contradiction to the Roman spirit, the character of Tiberius (Sueton. Tiber., c. 36: Externas ceremonias, Aegyptios Judaicosque ritus compescuit., c. 69: Circa deos ac religiones negligentior: quippe addictus mathematicae, plenusque persuasionis, cuncta fato agi), and the historical relations; while the silence of the Roman historian in gard to it would be inexplicable. The less credit is to be given to Tertullian's single testimony, inasmuch as he falsely ascribes to his contemporary Marcus Aurelius, partiality for the Christians, in a passage subsequent to the one in which he speaks of Tiberius. Yet the account is defended by J. W. T. Braun de Tiberii Christum in Deorum numerum referendi consilio comm. Bonnae, 1834. 8.

[3] Sueton. in Claudio, c. 25: Judaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit, cf. Act. xviii. 2. A play on the word, Χριστός, Χρηστός, sometimes used by the Christians (Justin. apol. maj., p. 45. Athenag. leg. 281, 282), sometimes declined (Tertull. apolog. 3: perperam Chrestianus pronuntiatur a vobis). Comp. the programm. of Ammon, 1803: Illustratur locus Suetonii de Judaeis imp. Chr. ass. tum. Credner's Einl. in d. N. T. i., ii., 380.

persecuted on account of their religion by *Nero*, when, to turn from himself the suspicion of setting fire to the city, he gave up the despised sectaries to all kinds of torture (64).[4] Probably the Neronian persecution was confined to Rome,[5] though it appears to have continued with some interruptions till the death of the tyrant (*Peter* and *Paul* suffered under him).[6]

[4] Tacit. ann. xv., 44. Sueton. Nero, c. 16.

[5] First extended to the provinces also by Orosius, vii. 7, whose opinion gained the assent of many till H. Dodwell in dissertt. Cyprianicarum (Oxon. 1684, 8.), dissert. xi. de paucitate martyrum, § 13, proved the opposite. Yet Theod. Ruinart in praefat. ad acta Martyr. sincera, § 3, still defended the opinion of Orosius. The inscription pretending to have been found in Spain or Portugal: Neroni ob provinciam latronibus et his qui novam generi humano superstitionem inculcabant, purgatam (Jan. Gruteri inscript., t. i., p. 238, n. 9), is spurious, and was forged perhaps by Cyriacus of Ancona. See Ferreras histoire d'Espagne., i. 192. Defended by J. E. J. Walch persecutionis Christianorum Neronianae in Hispania ex ant. monumentis probandae uberior explanatio. Jenae, 1753. 4. But compare especially the epistola Hagenbuchii, p. 31—60, there given.

[6] Since the Christians constantly expected Antichrist as the forerunner of Christ to be near at hand, it is not to be wondered at that Nero during his persecution should appear to them as Antichrist, and that they entertained the opinion after his death that he had not actually died, but should soon return again to undertake a final persecution. Hence the Apocalypse (written about 69) xiii. 3; xvii. 10, 11, and the Sybilline oracles, iv. 116 (which verses, according to Bleek in Schleiermacher's, De Wette's, and Lücke's theol. Zeitschrift, i. 244, were composed about the year 80 A.D.) That the like report among the heathen originated in that sentiment of the Christians, is at once apparent from the form of it, comp. Sueton. Nero, c. 40: Praedictum a mathematicis Neroni olim erat, fore, ut quandoque destitueretur. Spoponderant tamen quidam destituto Orientis dominationem, nonnulli nominatim regnum Hierosolymorum. Hence the Pseudoneronen. Sueton. l. c. c. 57. Tacit. hist., ii. 8. Dio Cassius, lxiv. 10. Among the Christians that expectation survived for several centuries. Lactant. de morte persecut., c. 2. Sulpic. Sever. hist. sacr., ii. 28, § 1, 29, § 6, dial. ii., c. 14. Hieronym. in Daniel xi. 28, in Esaiam xvii. 13, ad Algasiam qu. xi., and it was believed that Paul referred to Nero in 2 Thess. ii. 7. Chrysostom., Theodoret, Theophyl., and Oecumen. on this passage. Augustin. de civ. Dei xx., c. 19. Compare Corodi's krit. Gesch. d. Chiliasmus., ii. 309. Lücke's Einl. in d. Offenb. Johannis. S. 248. Credner's Einl. in d. N. T., i., ii. 704.

§ 29.

INTERNAL DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIANITY.

The assembly of the apostles and church at Jerusalem had allowed the Gentile Christians to observe the Mosaic law, but in so doing they had tacitly recognised its binding force on the posterity of Abraham. Since, therefore, on this account the Jewish Christians must have avoided intimate intercourse with the Gentile Christians, for the sake of Levitical purity; and since the one party looked upon *James*, the Lord's brother, and on *Peter*, as their leaders, while the other took *Paul* for their head (Gal. ii. 9), a certain wall of partition necessarily stood between them, and perfect incorporation into one brotherhood was impossible. This must have been first felt in many churches gathered from among Jews and Gentiles by Paul out of Palestine (Gal. ii. 11 ff.) The very circumstance, however, contributed, in no small degree, to lead that apostle to a more spiritual development of Christianity, and one freer from the national prejudices of the Jews.[1] He attained, accordingly, to the inward perception of the truth, that spiritual communion with God by faith in Christ alone constitutes the essence of Christianity. In this conviction, he was not afraid to overstep those rules of the council at Jerusalem in a twofold manner, both by declaring the obligation of the Jews to observe the Mosaic law invalid (Romans vii. 1 ff.; 1 Cor. ix. 20, 21; Gal. ii. 15 ff.), while he regarded that law merely as preparatory to Christ (Gal. iii. 24); and also by denying the absolute binding force of the laws regarding food given to the Gentile Christians (1 Cor. viii. 10, 23, ff.), while with reference to all such external institutes he merely required some regard for the consciences of weaker brethren, and practised himself such forbearance (1 Cor. viii. 9 ff.; x. 32; Acts xxi. 26). The other national prejudice of the Jewish Christians, viz. carnal millennarianism, likewise disappeared

[1] G. W. Meyer Entwickelung des Paulin. Lehrbegriffs. Altona, 1801. (J. G. F. Leun) reine Auffassung des Urchristenthums in den Paulin. Briefen. Leipzig, 1803. L. Usteri Entwickelung des Paul. Lehrbegriffs. Zürich, 1832. 4te Aufl. Neander apost. K., ii. 503. A. F. Dähne Entwickelung des Paulin. Lehrbegriffs. Halle, 1835. 8.

from his mind along with an overweening estimate of the Mosaic law. He thought, indeed, of the return of Jesus as near at hand (Phil. iv. 5), but he expected the triumph of God's kingdom in a state above the earthly (1 Thess. iv. 16, 17; 2 Cor. v. 1, 2). Christ himself was conceived of by Paul, who had seen him in the clouds of heaven, more in his spiritual and divine aspect; while the Jewish apostles, in consequence of the personal intercourse with him which they had enjoyed, dwelt more on his human appearance.

The Palestinian Christians might have overlooked the new development of doctrine, inasmuch as they had been accustomed to much more important doctrinal differences springing out of Judaism, without forfeiting the privileges of ecclesiastical fellowship. On the other hand, they attributed to Paul's loose view of the law, by which he drew away so many Jews from the observance of its precepts, in the Gentile-Christian churches, so much the greater mischief, because the other apostles conformed to the stricter view (Acts xxi. 20 ff.). Nor, on the other side, could the Palestinian appear to the Pauline Christians in any other light than as obtuse, because they had not long ago penetrated into the essence of Christianity (Heb. v. 11, 12).

The difference between these two parties is still more strongly manifested, in the aberrations into which they respectively fell from the positions they had assumed. Among the Jewish Christians,[2] a party always continued, who asserted the absolutely binding nature of the Mosaic law in relation to the Gentiles. By this means many belonging to Gentile-Christian churches were led astray, so that Paul felt the necessity of combating the error (*Ep. to the Galatians; Phil.* iii. 2). And when persecutions befel the Christians in Palestine, shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem, many of them were on the point of falling away entirely from Christianity (Hebrews vi. 4 ff.; x. 25 ff.),[3] having been rendered impatient, partly by the long-continued disappointment of their millennarian expectations, partly because they could not decide upon a complete separation from Judaism, which now appeared necessary.

Among the Gentile Christians, on the contrary, philosophy

[2] Dav. van Heyst diss. de Judaeo-Christianismo ejusque vi et efficacitate, quam exseruit in rem christianam saec. primo. Lugd. Bat., 1828. 8. C. F. Scharling de Paulo Apostolo ejusque adversariis. Havniae, 1836. 8.

[3] Brief a. d. Hebräer erläutert v. F. Bleek, i. 60 ff.

early began to mingle itself with Christianity. Thus much we know, that *Apollos*, a cultivated Alexandrian Jew, was the first who looked at Christianity from a more speculative point of view, and first preached it in this form with great eloquence at Corinth.[4] Little as he desired to appear in an antagonist position to Paul, the latter declined in reputation, notwithstanding, among many of the Corinthians, and divisions arose in the church (1 Cor. 1—4).[5] Paul wishes to leave it to time to discover the value of such a philosophical system erected on the foundation of Christian faith (1 Cor. iii. 11 ff.); but he blames the divisions occasioned by it, agreeably to his manner of inculcating toleration even in regard to errors, provided they be not practically scandalous or claim for themselves exclusive adoption (Rom. xiv. 1 ff.). Afterwards, however, there appeared among the Gentile Christians actual errors, and those too of an important moral bearing, which Paul was obliged to combat with all his might.

The Christians considered themselves, in opposition to the rest of the world (ὁ κόσμος, ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος, under the κοσμοκράτωρ, Eph. vi. 12, the θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου 2 Cor. iv. 4) hastening in their perversity to destruction, a chosen people dedicated to God, ἅγιοι,[6] ἐκλεκτοί, κλητοί. In these appellations there was no claim to moral perfection, but a remembrance of their high calling in Christ. Though it is certain that Christianity in its first beginning imparted spiritual enlightenment to many of its adherents, and transformed them in a moral view, yet it could so much the less purify them all from the imperfections of the education belonging to their nation and time, because it is certain that many of them had been led to embrace it by superstitious, or other interested motives.[7] This explains the reason why Paul found that he had

[4] Bleek l. c. p. 423 ff.

[5] Comp., in addition to the commentators, Baur on the Christ-party, in the Tübingen Zeitschr. für Theol., 1831, iv. 83. Comp., 1836, iv. Neander's apost. Kirche., i. 292. Dan. Schenkel de ecclesia Corinthiaca primaeva factionibus turbata. Basil., 1838. 8. A. F. Dähne die Christuspartei in d. apost. Kirche zu Korinth. Halle, 1841. 8. Die Parteiungen in d. Gem. zu Korinth, v. F. Becker. Altona, 1842. 8. Th. F. Kniewel ecclesiae Corinthiorum vetustissimae dissensiones. Gedani, 1842. 4. [Eclectic Review, May 1846.]

[6] As the later Jews עַם־קְדֹשִׁים, Dan. viii. 24, cf. vii. 18 ss.

[7] One-sided laudatory descriptions are given in William Cave's Primitive Christianity, or the religion of the ancient Christians in the first

continually to contend with even gross vices among the Gentile Christians, particularly at *Corinth* (1 Cor. v. 6), and in *Crete* (Titus i. 10 ff.); why James saw himself obliged to condemn the moral abuse of the Pauline doctrine relative to the power of faith, as that alone which brings blessing (*Ep. of James*); and why the Apocalypse (written 69 A.D.) denounces seducers in Pergamus (*the Nicolaitanes*),[8] who paid no regard to the regulations respecting food enjoined on the Gentile Christians, nor even to the prohibition of lewdness (Acts xv. 29). But after a philosophical treatment of Christianity had procured friends to the Gentile Christians in many churches, the superstitious philosophy of the times also speedily crept in among the Christians, first of all, as it would appear, in Asia Minor, and threatened morality with still greater danger by recommending chimerical, mysterious doctrines, and an arbitrary asceticism, as the true mode of purifying the soul. Against such errorists as united a

ages of the gospel. ed. 5., Lond., 1689 (translated into German by Frauendorf, Leipz., 1694 and 1723. 8), and Gottfr. Arnold's erste Liebe, d. i. wahre Abbildung der ersten Christen. Frankf., 1696 fol. Leipz., 1732. 4. Sometimes unjust to the Christians, but otherwise worth reading, is L. A. Paetz comm. de vi, quam religio christ. per iii. priora saecula ad hominum animos, mores, ac vitam habuit. Gotting., 1799. 4. Comp. A. Neander das christl. Leben der drei ersten Jahrhunderte, in his Denkwürdigkeiten aus d. Gesch. des Christenth. Bd. 1. Berlin, 1823. J. G. Stickel et C. F. Bogenhard biga commentationum de morali primaevorum Christianorum conditione. Neostad. ad Orlam, 1826. 8.

[8] Apoc. ii. 6, 14, 15. Those who κρατοῦντες τὴν διδαχὴν Βαλαὰμ (cf. Numb. xxxi. 16, and those who κρατοῦντες τὴν διδαχὴν τῶν Νικολαϊτῶν are the same. בִּלְעָם is derived from בְּלַע עַם, even among the Rabbins. Buxtorf. lex. talmud., p. 314: to which corresponds νικᾶν τὸν λαόν. So first Chr. A. Heumann in Actis erudit. an. 1712, p. 179. Ejusd. Poecile, ii. 392. Münscher in Gabler's Journal für theol. Liter., v. 17. Eichhorn and Ewald in their commentaries on Apoc. ii. 6. Hence the appellation Nicolaitanes was not the common name for a sect, but one invented by the Apocalyptic writer. As the names of sects were usually formed after the name of the founder, the fathers thought of Nicolaus, Acts vi. 5, who, according to Irenaeus, i. 26, iii. 11, and Tertullian de praescr. haer., c. 46, is said to have been the founder of the party; but according to Clemens Alex. Strom., ii., p. 490, iii., p. 522, he was merely the unconscious cause of the appellation on account of his words which were misunderstood by others, ὅτι παραχρῆσασθαι τῇ σαρκὶ δεῖ. (παραχρᾶσθαι is, 1. to abuse, used particularly, according to Suidas de concubitu immodico; 2. equiv. to διαχρᾶσθαι, to put to death, as Justin. apol. maj., c. 49.)

Jewish-heathen asceticism with a peculiar philosophy, Paul had first to warn the Colossians (Col. ii. 8, 16, ff.).[9] The same tendency spread itself as far as Ephesus, where it manifested itself in high-flying speculations, in prohibitions of marriage and meats (1 Tim. i. 5—7; iv. 3, 7; vi. 20), and manifestly contributed to the immorality of that place (2 Tim. iii. 6). The attempt, also, of *Hymeneus* and *Philetus* to explain spiritually (2 Tim. ii. 18) the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, so offensive to the heathen (1 Thessal. iv. 13 ff.; 1 Cor. xv. 12, 35, ff.), an attempt that proceeded from the same tendency, was not destitute of a moral influence at this time, when the doctrine was most intimately connected with that of retribution.[10] That Paul did not reject philosophy as such, he has proved in his conduct towards Apollos; *the philosophy* against which he warns his readers (Col. ii. 8) is that *science, falsely so called* (1 Tim. vi. 20) which, as Paul had before judged, became now, for the first time, the source of still greater errors, of the later gnostic reveries (2 Tim. iii. 1 ff.).[11]

[9] Matth. Schneckenburger über die Irrlehrer zu Colossä, annexed to his treatise Ueber das Alter der jüd. Proselytentaufe. Berlin, 1828. 8. S. 187 ff. The same author's Beiträge zur Einl. ins N. T. Stuttgart, 1832. S. 146. The same author's Bemerkungen über die Irrlehrer zu Colossä, theol. Studien. u. Krit., 1832, iv. 841. Neander apost. K., i. 374. F. H. Rheinwald de pseudodoctoribus Colossensibus. Bonnae, 1834. 4. Osiander über die colossichen Irrlehrer, in the Tübingen Zeitschrift f. Theol., 1834., iii. 96. [Eclectic Review, March 1845.]

[10] That consciousness and feeling could not be conceived of apart from bodies, was a very common notion of antiquity. Comp. the Epicurean Vellejus in Cic. de nat. deor., ii., c. 12: Quod (Plato) sine corpore ullo Deum vult esse—id quale esse possit, intelligi non potest. Careat enim sensu necesse est, careat etiam prudentia, careat voluptate. The heathen Caecilius in Minucius Felix, c. 11, says: Vellem tamen sciscitari, utrumne sine corpore an cum corporibus, et corporibus quibus, ipsisne an innovatis, resurgatur? Sine corpore? hoc, quod sciam, neque mens, neque anima, nec vita est. Ipso corpore? sed jam ante dilapsum est. Alio corpore? ergo homo novus nascitur, non prior ille reparatur. Justini dial. c. Tryph., c. 1: ἀπαθὲς γὰρ τὸ ἀσώματον. Tertulliani apologeticus, c. 48: Ideo repraesentabuntur et corpora, quia neque pati quicquam potest anima sola sine stabili materia, i.e. carne caet.

[11] The traces of Gnosis in the N. T. are exaggerated, particularly by Henr. Hammond diss. de Antichristo (in his diss. iv. quibus episcopatus jura adstruuntur. Lond. 1651), and in his Annot. ad N. T. (lat. per. J. Clericum. Amst. 1698, fol.) But, on the other side, C. Chr. Tittmann tract. de vestigiis Gnosticorum in N. T. frustra quaesitis. Lips. 1773, 8), goes too far. Comp. Joh. Horn über die biblische Gnosis. Hannover 1805, 8.

In strong relief to these defects of the time, the brotherly love, the benevolence (2 Cor. viii. 1 ff.; Heb. vi. 10; xiii. 1 ff.), the patient endurance of the hostility of the unbelieving (Phil. i. 29; 1 Thess. i. 6; ii. 14; 2 Thess. i. 4 ff.; Heb. x. 32 ff.), and the holy zeal for Christianity, form the bright part of the picture presented by the first Christians. The church at Philippi, in its tender attachment to the apostle Paul, appears to us particularly attractive. (Comp. *the Ep. to the Philippians.*)

§ 30.

CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

Die Anfänge d. christl. Kirche u. ihrer Verfassung von R. Rothe. Bd. I. Wittenberg 1837. S. 141.

The new churches out of Palestine formed themselves after the pattern of the mother church in Jerusalem. Their presidents were *the elders* (πρεσβύτεροι, ἐπίσκοποι),[1] officially of equal rank, al-

[1] That both appellations are the same follows from Acts xx. 17, 28; Tit. i. 5, 7; Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 1, 8. Acknowledged by Hieronymus Epist. 82, (al. 83) ad Oceanum: apud veteres iidem episcopi et presbyteri, quia illud nomen dignitatis est, hoc aetatis. Epist. 101, ad Evangelum see below, § 34, not. 2.—Idem ad Tit. i. 7. Idem est ergo presbyter, qui episcopus: et antequam diaboli instinctu studia in religione fierent, et diceretur in populis: ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego autem Cephae, communi presbyterorum consilio ecclesiae gubernabantur. Postquam vero unusquisque eos, quos baptizaverat, suos putabat esse, non Christi; in toto orbe decretum est, ut unus de presbyteris electus superponeretur caeteris. ad quem omnis ecclesiae cura pertineret, et schismatum semina tollerentur. Putat aliquis non scripturarum, sed nostram esse sententiam, episcopum et presbyterum unum esse, et aliud aetatis, aliud esse nomen officii: relegat apostoli ad Philippenses verba, dicentis. Here follow the above cited passages; then: Haec propterea, ut ostenderemus, apud veteres eosdem fuisse presbyteros, quos et episcopos: paulatim vero ut dissensionum plantaria evellerentur, ad unum omnem sollicitudinem esse delatam. Sicut ergo presbyteri sciunt, se ex ecclesiae consuetudine ei, qui sibi praepositus fuerit, esse subjectos: ita episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine, quam dispositionis dominicae veritate, presbyteris esse majores, et in commune debere ecclesiam regere. Augustini epist. 82, ad Hieron. c. 33: Quamquam secundum honorum vocabula, quae jam ecclesiae usus obtinuit, episcopatus presbyterio major sit: tamen in multis rebus Augustinus Hieronymo minor est. Cf. Chrysostomi hom. i. in Ep. ad Philipp. Theodoret. comm. in

though in many churches, individuals among them had a personal

Philipp. i. 1. It is remarkable how long afterwards persons maintained this view of the original identity of bishops and presbyters. Isidorus Hispal. etymol. vii. c. 12, transcribes that passage from Hieron. epist. ad Oceanum. Bernaldus Constantiensis (about 1088) the most zealous defender of Gregory VII. appeals on this subject in his de presbyterorum officio tract. (in monumentorum res Allemannorum illustrantt. S. Blas. 1792, 4. T. ii. p. 384 ss.) to the New Testament and Jerome, and then continues: Quum igitur presbyteri et episcopi antiquitus idem fuisse legantur, etiam eandem ligandi atque solvendi potestatem et alia nunc episcopis specialia habuisse non dubitantur. Postquam autem presbyteri ab episcopali excellentia cohibiti sunt, coepit eis non licere, quod licuit, videlicet quod ecclesiastica auctoritas solis pontificibus exequendum delegavit. Even a pope, Urbanus II., in Conc. Benevent. ann. 1091, can. 1: Sacros autem ordines dicimus diaconatum et presbyteratum. Hos siquidem solos primitiva legitur ecclesia habuisse: super his solum praeceptum habemus apostoli (pretty nearly the same words are found in Petri Lomb. sentent. lib. iv. dist. 24, c. 8). Hence even Gratian receives the above passages of Jerome ad Tit. i. (dist. xcv., c. 5), epist. ad Evangel. (dist. xciii.. c. 24) u. Isidori Hisp. (dist. xxi. c. 1) without scruple. The same view is maintained by the Glossa ad Gratiani decret. dist. xciii. c. 24, Cardinalis S. Marci at the Costnit Concilium 1414 (v. d. Hardt. Conc. Const. ii. 228), Nicolaus Tudeschus, archiep. Panormitanus (about 1428) super prima parte Primi cap. 5, (ed. Lugdun. 1547, fol. 112, b.: olim Presbyteri in commune regebant ecclesiam et ordinabant sacerdotes), Nicolaus Cusanus (about 1435) de concordantia cath. lib. iii. c. 2, (in Schardii syntagma tractatuum, p. 358), where he remarks, in opposition to the genuineness of the Pseudo-Isidore letters of Clement: Invenitur insuper in ipsis epistolis de episcoporum a sacerdotibus differentia, quae longo tempore post hoc, ut Hieronymo placet et Damaso, in ecclesia orta est. Even the papal canonist Jo. Paul Lancelottus, in his Institutt. juris canon. lib. i. Tit. 21, § 3, unfolds the same view (1563) with a sunt, qui affirment, without adding anything in refutation of it. Since no value was set, during the middle ages, on the distinction between the institutio divina and ecclesiastica, a distinction on which modern Catholics insist, ecclesiastical practice could not disturb that view. But after the Council of Trent, sess. xxiii. (15th July 1563) cap. 4, had declared, episcopos, qui in apostolorum locum successerunt, —positos—a spiritu sancto, regere ecclesiam Dei, eosque presbyteris superiores esse etc., the old view became suspicious, although the council did not expressly or definitely maintain the institutio divina. Michael de Medina (about 1570) de orig. sacr. homin. did not hesitate to declare, illos patres materiales fuisse haereticos, sed in his patribus ob eorum reverentiam hoc dogma non esse damnatum. But Bellarmin de clericis, lib. i. c. 15, calls this sententiam valde inconsideratam, and would rather resort to the expedient of an interpretation. Although, afterwards, among Catholic theologians Edmundus Richerius (defensio libelli de eccles. et polit potest. T. ii. p. 52 ss.) defended the view of Jerome, and John Morin (de sacris ecclesiae ordinationibus, p. iii. Exerc. iii. c. 3) asserted, that the opinion was at least not heretical, episcopos

authority over the others.[2] Under the superintendence of these elders were *the deacons* and *deaconesses* (Rom. xvi. 1; 1 Tim. v. 9, 10).[3] All these officers received their support, in so far as they needed, as well as the poor, from the free-will contributions of the church (1 Tim. v. 17; 1 Cor. ix. 13). The duty of teaching as an office was by no means incumbent on the elders,[4] although the apostle wishes that they should be διδακτικοί, *apt to teach* (1 Tim. iii. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 24). The capacity for instructing and edifying in the assemblies was rather considered as a free gift of the Spirit (χάρισμα πνευματικόν), which manifested itself in many Christians, although in different modes (προφήτης—διδάσκαλος —γλώσσῃ λαλῶν, 1 Cor. xii. 28—31, c. 14). Still less was a distinct priestly order known at this time; for the whole society of Christians formed a royal priesthood (βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, 1 Peter ii. 9), God's peculiar people (κλῆρος נחלה, 1 Peter v. 3; *cf. Deut.*

non jure divino esse presbyteris superiores; yet, since the Tridentine council, the institutio divina of episcopacy, and its original distinction from presbyteratus became the general doctrine of the catholic church, which the English Episcopalians also followed in this particular, while the other Protestant churches returned to the most ancient doctrine and regulation on the subject. The first leading works in favour of the modern Catholic view are Petavii de ecclesiastica hierarchia. libb. v. and dissertatt. theologic. lib. i. in his theolog. dogmat. tom. iv. p. 164. On the other side, Walonis Messalini (Claud. Salmasii) diss. de episcopis et presbyteris. Lugd. Bat. 1641, 8. Dav. Blondelli apologia pro sententia Hieronymi de episcopis et presbyteris. Amstelod. 1646, 4. Against these H. Hammond wrote dissert. iv. quibus episcopatus jura ex sacra scriptura et prima antiquitate adstruuntur. Lond. 1651. The controversy was still continued; on the side of the Episcopalians by Jo. Pearson, William Beveridge, Henr. Dodwell, Jos. Bingham, Jac. Usserius. The view of the Presbyterians was defended by Jo. Dallaeus, Camp. Vitringa; also the Lutherans, Joach. Hildebrand, Just. Henn. Boehmer, Jo. Franc. Buddeus, Christ. Matth. Pfaff, &c. Comp. Jo. Phil. Gabler de episcopis primae ecclesiae Christ. eorumque origine diss. Jenae 1805, 4. Rothe's Anf. d. christl. Kirche. i. 171.

[2] So Epaphras appears to have had a certain superiority for a length of time in Colossae (Col. i. 7, iv. 12); then Archippus, supported by the reputation of his father Philemon, (Col. iv. 17; Philemon i. 2). Comp. the σύζυγος γνήσιος, Phil. iv. 3.

[3] Respecting Deaconesses see Rothe i. 243.

[4] Against the division into presbyteros docentes and regentes (first made by Calvin. institutt. christ. relig. lib. iv. c. 3, § 8: verbi ministros s. episcopos und gubernatores s. seniores ex plebe delectos,—afterwards made a part of the constitution of the Presbyterian church) see Vitringa de Synag. vetere lib. ii. c. 2. Neander apost. Kirche i. 186. Rothe i. 221.

iv. 20; ix. 29).[5] The Christians met in private houses; in many cities the churches were divided into several smaller communities meeting in different places.[6] In their assemblies, there was an interchange of reading out of the Old Testament, explanation of what was read, free discourse, singing,[7] and prayer (Col. iii. 16; 1 Tim. iv. 13). The letters of Paul also were read, and sent from one church to another (Col. iv. 16; 1 Thess. v. 27). The covenant-supper of Jesus was solemnized in an actual even-

[5] Tertullianus de exhort. castit. c. 7: Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit ecclesiae auctoritas. Ambrosiaster (Hilarius Diaconus) about 380 in comment. ad Ephes. iv. 11: Primum omnes docebant et omnes baptizabant. quibuscunque diebus vel temporibus fuisset occasio; nec enim, Philippus tempus quaesivit aut diem, quo eunuchum baptizaret neque jejunium interposuit.—Ut ergo cresceret plebs et multiplicaretur, omnibus inter initia concessum est et evangelizare et baptizare et scripturas in ecclesia explanare. At ubi omnia loca complexa est ecclesia, conventicula constituta sunt et rectores, et caetera officia in ecclesiis sunt ordinata, ut nullus de clericis [perhaps ceteris] auderet, qui ordinatus non esset, praesumere officium, quod sciret non sibi creditum vel concessum. Et coepit alio ordine et providentia gubernari ecclesia, quia si omnes eadem possent, irrationabile esset, et vulgaris res et vilissima videretur. Hinc ergo est, unde nunc neque diaconi in populo praedicant, neque clerici vel laici baptizant, neque quocunque die credentes tinguntur, nisi aegri. Ideo non per omnia conveniunt scripta apostoli ordinationi, quae nunc in ecclesia est, quia haec inter primordia sunt scripta.

[6] ἐκκλησίαι κατ' οἶκον, Rom. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Philem. ver. 2; Col. iv. 15. N. Chr. Kist über den Ursprung der bischöfl. Gewalt, (aus d. Archief voor Kerkerlijke Geschiedenis, Deel. 2, translated into German in Illgen's Zeitschrift für die hist. Theol. ii. 2, 54), thinks that these churches in houses, belonging to one town, were established by different teachers, and without a common government. Baur (Pastoralbriefe s. 78 ff.) infers from Titus i. 5, that every church had but one elder, and that where several elders are represented as being in one city, each governed independently a particular church. The analogy of the synagogue, however, is in favour of the plurality of elders in a church; for the connection of the elders of one city into a college, and, consequently, of the churches in houses into one church, (even if every house-church, as every synagogue, had its particular elders), those passages speak in which the collected elders of one city appear and act as a united whole. Comp. Acts xv. 4, xx. 7; Phil. i. 1; Jac. v. 14. Comp. Rothe i. 180 ff.

[7] On the nature of the singing see Isidor. Hispal. de eccles. offic. i. 5: Primitiva ecclesia ita psallebat, ut modico flexu vocis faceret psallentem resonare. ita ut pronuntianti vicinior esset quam canenti (out of Augustini confess. X. xxxiii. 2: [Alexandrinus episcopus Athanasius] tam modico flexu vocis faciebat sonare lectorem psalmi, ut pronuntianti vicinior esset quam canenti).

ing meal (*ἀγάπη*, 1 Cor. xvi. 20).[8] The kiss of charity was customary, the token of brotherly love in the assemblies (*φίλημα ἀγάπης, φίλημα ἅγιον*, Rom. xvi. 16; 1. Pet. v. 14). The other regulations of the churches were left free to each society, innocent national customs being observed (1 Cor. xi. 4); and therefore they differed in separate communities. While the Jewish Christians of Palestine retained the entire Mosaic law, and consequently the Jewish festivals, the Gentile Christians observed also *the Sabbath* and *the passover* (1 Cor. v. 6—8), with reference to the last scenes of Jesus's life, but without Jewish superstition (Gal. iv. 10; Col. ii. 16). In addition to these, Sunday, as the day of Christ's resurrection (Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2.—Apoc. i. 10. *ἡ κυριακὴ ἡμέρα*[9]), was devoted to religious services. All bodily asceticism was valued only as a means of virtue, and left to the free discretion of individuals. Thus, fasting was looked upon as a suitable preparation for prayer (Acts xiii. 2, 3; xiv. 23); celibacy was regarded by Paul desirable on account of the distressing times impending (1 Cor. vii. 26); but this very apostle requires that all these abstinences should be left to the free choice of every one (Romans xiv. 17; 1 Cor. viii. 7; 1 Tim. iv. 3).—Immoral members were excluded from the church (1 Cor. v. 2—3), repentance and improvement forming the conditions of restoration (2 Cor. ii. 5—8).

The idea set forth by Christ of the union of his people with himself, and with one another in one joint body (John x. 16; xv. 1 ff.), was kept alive by the apostles (*σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*. Romans xii. 5; 1 Cor. x. 17; xii. 13; Ephes. ii. 16; iv. 4; xii.; xvi.; Col. iii. 15. *ἐκκλησία* Acts ix. 31; xx. 28; 1 Cor. x. 32; xii. 28; Ephes. iii. 10).[10] This unity did not, indeed, obtain, for a long time, the corresponding external form; but it had an external opposition in the unbelieving, and an external centre-point in the apostles,[11] who exercised a general survey over all the churches (2 Cor. xi. 28), and were co-overseers in every single church (*συμπρεσβύτεροι* 1 Peter v. 1). As they had themselves divided the large sphere

[8] J. Th. Fr. Drescher de veterum Christian. agapis. Giessae 1824, 8.

[9] These passages furnish valid proof when taken in connection with the fact, that the observance of Sunday is pre-supposed as an established custom, in Epist. Barnab. c. 15: *ἄγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὀγδόην εἰς εὐφροσύνην, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς.* cf. C. Chr. L. Franke de diei dominici apud veteres Christianos celebratione comm. Halae 1826. 8. Neander apost. K. i. 198.

[10] Rothe i. 282. [11] Rothe i. 302.

of their activity by the separation into apostles of the Jews and of the Gentiles (Gal. ii. 7—9); so, again, did each one find in the churches he had himself founded, his narrower field of labour (Romans xv. 20), without, however, being prevented by this circumstance from being zealous for Christianity in other churches also. The first arrangement in the newly planted churches, even the appointment of elders in them, was made by the apostles themselves (Acts xiv. 23). Afterwards, the officers belonging to societies of Christians were nominated by elders with the consent of the churches.[12] In the newly established churches, Paul was accustomed to transfer the first arrangement and superintendence to one of his assistants (Acts xvii. 14; 1 Tim. i. 3 ff.; Titus i. 5 ff.), who then had a routine of duties similar to those of the later bishops, though not bound to any particular church.[13] They belonged rather to the class of teachers who, without being confined to one place, preached the gospel as opportunity offered (εὐαγγελισταί 2 Tim. iv. 5). *James*, the Lord's brother, occupied a peculiar position. He stood in Jerusalem, where he continued to reside, at the head of the church, in equal esteem with the apostles, and with extensive influence and reputation, quite in the relation of a later bishop, but without the appellation.[14]

§ 31.

TIME OF THE JEWISH DISTURBANCES.

The Jewish expectations of the Messiah had constantly been most lively under the oppression of foreign rulers, and had expressed themselves among the Palestinian Jews in one of the old Hebrew prophecies. But they had given themselves expression also by Apocalyptic visions of exceeding definiteness and richness in imagery, viz. (*the book of Daniel*[1]) under Antiochus Epiphanes;

[12] Clement of Rome, epist. i. 44, says, that the presbyters were at first appointed (καταστάθέντες) by the apostles, afterwards ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, συνευδοκησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησιας πάσης, as according to Cyprian, epist. 52, the bishop was chosen de clericorum testimonio, de plebis suffragio.

[13] Rothe i. 305.

[14] Gal. i. 19, ii. 12; Act. xii. 17, xv. 13, xxi. 18. (Comp. § 25, note 2. § 26, 6, note 4). Rothe S. 264.

[1] Bleek über Verf. u. Zweck des B. Daniel, a review of the inquiries

the book[2] *of Enoch* (under Herod the Great). The times of oppression, in like manner, before and after the destruction of Jerusalem, furnished new nourishment to such expectations (*4th book of Ezra*).[3] Alexandrian Jews, on the other hand, made use of the widely spread form of the *sybilline* oracles,[4] in order to oppose idolatry, and to procure respect among the

made into these points, in the theol. Zeitschrift v. Schleiermacher, de Wette und Lücke iii. 171. Against Hengstenberg (die Authentie des Daniel u. die Integrität des Sacharjah. Berlin 1831) and Hävernick (Comm. über d. B. Daniel. Hamburg 1832) comp. C. v. Lengerke d. B. Daniel. Königsberg 1835, Redepenning in the theol. Studien u. Krit. 1833, iii. 831, 1835, i. 163.

[2] Preserved in an Ethiopic version first translated into English by R. Laurence. Oxford, 3d edition, 1838. A. G. Hoffmann's Buch Henoch in vollständiger (translated from the English as far as the 55th chapter, the remainder from the Ethiopic) übersetzung, mit Commentar, einleitung und Excursen. 2 Abth. Jena 1833, 38, 8vo. According to Laurence, Hoffmann i. 23, Gfrörer (Jahrhundert des Heils i. 96) and Wieseler, (die 70 Wochen und die 63 Jahrwochen des proph. Daniel. Göttingen 1839, S. 163) it belongs to the first year of the reign of Herod the Great; according to Hoffmann's later opinion, (ii. vorr. S. 11), to the conclusion of the Maccabean period. Lücke (Einl. in die Offenbar. Johannis, S. 60) places it in the time of the Jewish war, probably after the destruction of Jerusalem. So, in like manner, Credner, (Einl. in d. N. T. i. ii. 712), in the time about which the Apocalypse was written. Unquestionably, Christian elements have been pointed out by Lücke (S. 75) in the book, which, however, first came into it by means of a later revision. [Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature, book of Enoch.)

[3] The Greek original is lost. There are preserved an old Latin translation, (in J. A. Fabricii codex pseudepigraphus V. T. iii. 173), an Ethiopic, (Primi Ezrae libri, qui apud Vulgatam appellatur quartus, versio aethiopica, nunc primo in medium prolata, et latine angliceque reddita a R. Laurence. Oxon. 1820, 8), and a paraphrasing Arabic one (translated into English in Whiston's primitive christianity, iv.; its variations are also found in Fabricius l. c.) On the book comp. Corodi's Krit. Gesch. des Chiliasmus i. 179; Lücke a. a. O. S. 78; Gfrörer a. a. O. i. 69; Wieseler a. a. O. S. 206. Ch. J. van der Vlis disp. crit. de Ezrae libro apocrypho, vulgo quarto dicto. Amstelod. 1839. 8. Laurence fixes the time of its writing between 28 and 25 B.C. Mick. Merkel (Vermischte Anmerkungen aus d. Philologie, Kritik. und Theologie, Erste Samm. Leipz. 1772, S. 75 ff.) places it in the time of Vespasian. On the other hand, Corodi, Lücke, Gfrörer, and Wieseler, in the end of the first century. It was written by a Jew, but interpolated by a Christian hand. From the latter proceed cap. i. ii. xv. and xvi. entirely.

[4] After the genuine Sybillines had been burnt along with the capitol 74 B.C., and persons began to collect new sybillines, they sprang up in so great numbers that the loss in the capitol was not only replaced very soon, but Augustus could even cause such writings to be deposited in

heathen for their people and their fortunes. The more the Christians were inclined to see the beginning of the end in the oppressions of that time, the easier access to them did such writings obtain, and the more readily were they imitated (first *Christian sybillines.*)[5]

When Jewish fanaticism pressed severely on the Christians of Jerusalem immediately before its destruction, and even *James*, the Lord's brother (69 A.D.), fell a sacrifice to it;[6] the most of

the temple of Apollo on the Palatine, (Sueton. Aug. c. 31). Although at that time the possession of all soothsaying books was forbidden, yet numerous sybilline predictions were constantly circulated among the people, (Tacit. Ann. vi. 12). The first certain trace of Jewish sybillines is to be found in Joseph. Ant. i. 4, 3, (cf. orac. Sybill. iii. 35). The sybillines now extant (Sybillinorum oraculorum libb. viii. ed. Jo. Opsopoeus. Paris 1589, ed. 3, 1607, gr. 8vo. Servatius Gallaeus. Amst. 1689, 4. Gallandius in his Bibl. pp. i. 133: to these have been lately added, libb. xi.—xiv. in Ang. Maji scriptorum vett. nova collectio T. iii. p. 3. Romae 1828. 4.) were usually before this time assigned to the second century, and to the Montanists; by many (Casaubon, Scaliger, Blondel) to Montanus himself. Huet conjectured their authors to be the Gnostics; Cave, Alexandrian Christians; Semler, Tertullian. Grotius regarded them as Jewish productions, afterwards interpolated by Christians. G. J. Vossius, however, perceived that they proceeded from several authors at different times. Birger Thorlacius (libri Sybillistarum veteris ecclesiae crisi, quatenus monumenta christiana sunt, subjecti, Hann. 1815, 8, and Conspectus doctr. christ. qualis in Sibyllistarum libris continetur. 1816, also in F. Münter miscellanea Hafniensia 1, i. 113) assumed that they had been for the greater part composed between 100 and 170 A.D., in Phrygia,—some of them, too, by Alexandrians. According to Bleek, (über die Entstehung u. Zusammensetzung d. sib. Or. in Schleiermacher's, De Wette's u. Lücke's theol. Zeitschrift i. 120, and ii. 172) the oldest of them are Jewish oracles belonging to the second century before Christ; the youngest, Christian oracles of the fifth century after Christ. The greatest part of the third book, and several sections in the fifth, (l. c. i. 198, ii. 182, 194), proceed from Alexandrian Jews. Gfrörer (Philo. ii. 121) agrees with him in this opinion, and points out Jewish-Alexandrian dogmas in these sections.

[5] According to Bleek (l. c., i. 240, ii. 232), the fourth book was composed by a Christian, about 80 A.D., probably in Asia Minor.

[6] Josephus Antiq., xx. 9, 1 (also in Eusebius ii. 23), relates: "The high-priest Ananus, a Sadducee, a severe and cruel man, made use of the time in which, after the death of Festus, the procurator, his successor Albinus had not yet entered on office (63 A.D.): καθίζει συνέδριον κριτῶν· καὶ παραγαγὼν εἰς αὐτὸ [τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ, Ἰάκωβος ὄνομα αὐτῷ, καὶ] τινας [ἑτέρους], ὡς παραιομησάντων κατηγορίαν ποιησάμενος, παρέδωκε λευσθησομένους. Many pious and zealous Jews were much displeased with this proceeding, and accused Ananus before King Agrippa and Albinus. Agrippa, therefore, deposed him from the office

the members of the church fled to Pella.[7] About this time also *John* repaired to Asia Minor, and there, full of the impressions which he had taken along with him from Palestine, and perceiving in these oppressions the beginning of the last events, wrote *the Apocalypse* (69 A.D.)[8] This was the commencing point of a rich apocalyptic literature among the Christians.

of high priest." Le Clerc, however, art. crit., ii. 223. Lardner suppl. vol. iii., cap. 16, sect. 5, and Credner (Einl. u. d. N. T. i., ii. 581) regard, on important grounds, the bracketed words as spurious. On the other hand, Hegesippus, in Euseb. ii. 23, according to the passage given in a preceding note (4, § 26), narrates the death of James in this manner: "By his preaching he had gained over many of the people to Christ, and stood generally in the highest repute as the righteous one. Hence the scribes and Pharisees demanded of him a solemn denial of Christ: ἔστησαν οὖν τὸν Ἰάκωβον ἐπὶ τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ναοῦ, καὶ ἔκραξαν αὐτῷ καὶ εἶπον· ὀίκαιε, ᾧ πάντες πείθεσθαι ὀφείλομεν, ἐπεὶ ὁ λαὸς πλανᾶται ὀπίσω Ἰησοῦ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος, ἀπάγγειλον ἡμῖν, τίς ἡ θύρα Ἰησοῦ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος. (θύρα as in Rabbinic שַׁעַר estimate, value. See Credner in the new Jena A. L. Z., August 1843. S. 795. "What is the disclosure, the truth of Christ?") Καὶ ἀπεκρίνατο φωνῇ μεγάλῃ· τί με ἐπερωτᾶτε περὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; καὶ αὐτὸς κάθηται ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς μεγάλης δυνάμεως, καὶ μέλλει ἔρχεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Since now many agreed with him, the scribes and Pharisees resolved to put him to death. Ἀναβάντες οὖν κατέβαλον τὸν ὀίκαιον —καὶ ἤρξαντο λιθάζειν αὐτόν. He was not, however, killed instantaneously, but still prayed for his murderers: καὶ λαβών τις ἀπ' αὐτῶν εἷς τῶν κναφέων τὸ ξύλον, ἐν ᾧ ἀπεπίεζε τὰ ἱμάτια, ἤνεγκε κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ ὀικαίου. καὶ οὕτως ἐμαρτύρησεν. Καὶ ἔθαψαν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῷ τόπῳ παρὰ τῷ ναῷ, καὶ ἔτι αὐτοῦ ἡ στήλη μένει παρὰ τῷ ναῷ. Καὶ εὐθὺς Οὐεσπασιανὸς πολιορκεῖ αὐτούς. In opposition to Josephus, who places the death of James in the year 63, there agree with the designation of time by Hegesippus, agreeably to which the siege of Jerusalem took place immediately after James's death, Eusebius iii. 11, (Symeon was chosen successor to James, μετὰ τὴν Ἰακώβου μαρτυρίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτίκα γενομένην ἅλωσιν τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ), although in his chronicle he places the death of James and the inauguration of Symeon after Josephus, in the seventh of Nero; the Clementines (so far the Ep. Clemen. Rom. ad Jacob, c. 1, in Cotelerii patres ap., i. 611, and Clementina epitome de gestis s. Petri, c. 147. l. c. p. 798, announce that Peter died before James), and the Paschal Chronicle, which (ed. Bonn., i. 460) places the death of James in the first year of Vespasian's reign. Comp. Credner Einleit. in d. N. T. i., ii. 580. Rothe Anfänge d. christl. Kirche, i. 275.

[7] Euseb. h. e. iii. 5. Epiphanius haer. xxix. 7, de mensuris et ponderibus, c. 15.

[8] This time is specified by Ewald comm. in Apoc., p. 48, and Lücke Einleit in d. Offenbar. Joh. S. 244. I cannot, however, bring myself to refuse to the apostle John the authorship of the book. The author designates himself as the apostle; the oldest witnesses declare him to be

THIRD CHAPTER.

AGE OF JOHN FROM 70–117.

§ 32.

FATE OF THE JEWISH CHRISTIANS IN PALESTINE.

Although a Jewish-Christian church soon formed itself among the ruins of Jerusalem,[1] and again selected a relative of Jesus, Symeon,[2] to be its head; yet after the judgment which had befallen Judaism[3]—this church could no longer continue to

so. Had the book been forged in his name thirty years before his death, he would certainly have contradicted it, and this contradiction would have reached us through Irenaeus from the school of John's disciples. On the contrary, the later contradictions of the apostolic origin proceed from doctrinal prepossession alone. The internal difference in language and mode of thought between the Apocalypse, which John, whose education was essentially Hebrew, and his Christianity Jewish-christian of the Palestinian character, wrote, and the gospel and epistles which he had composed after an abode of from twenty to thirty years among the Greeks, is a necessary consequence of the different relations in which the writer was placed, so that the opposite would excite suspicion. There is much at the same time that is cognate, proving continuousness of cultivation in the same author. Comp. F. Lücke Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis, und in die gesammte apokalyptische Literatur. Bonn., 1832. 8vo.

[1] Epiphanius de mensuris et ponderibus, c. 15. According to c. 14, the small Christian church on Mount Zion was among the few buildings that were spared.

[2] Euseb. iii. 11. See § 31, note 6. Hegesippus apud Euseb. iv. 22: Καὶ μετὰ τὸ μαρτυρῆσαι Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον—πάλιν ὁ ἐκ θείου αὐτοῦ Συμεών ὁ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ καθίσταται ἐπίσκοπος· ὃν προέθεντο πάντες, ὄντα ἀνεψιὸν τοῦ Κυρίου, δεύτερον. Clopas, the father of Symeon, was, according to Hegesippus in Euseb. iii. 11, a brother of Joseph. (Sophron. in app. ad Hieronymi catal., § 6, represents this Symeon as Judas, the brother of James, and moreover the apostle Simon Zelotes. In opposition to this, see Sam. Basnage annales politico-ecclesiastici ad ann. 31. no. 72.) These Jewish Christians generally preferred to choose relatives of our Lord as presidents of their churches. So Hegesippus relates (in Euseb. iii. 20) that the grandchildren of Judas, a brother of Christ, after they had been set free by Domitian, ἡγήσασθαι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, ὡς ἂν δὴ μάρτυρας ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γένους ὄντας τοῦ Κυρίου.

[3] The feeling of this is plainly expressed in the writings of this period. Barnabae epist., c. 9: ἡ περιτομή, ἐφ' ᾗ πεποίθασι, κατήργηται,

be a model mother-church, and the centre of Christendom. We have a proof that these Christians were continually hated by the Jews, in the composition of the work called בִּרְכַּת הַמִּינִים,[4] and in the crucifixion of *Symeon* at the age of 120[5] (107). After the death of this man, there also arose an internal division among them. An opposition in the church, which had existed since the apostolic council at Jerusalem, (Acts xv.), but had been hitherto restrained, now broke out openly *(Thebuthis)*,[6] and from

even for the Jews. The law of Moses had only a typical meaning, particularly the laws regarding meats (c. 10); the Jews are not heirs of the promises, but the Christians (c. 13, 14); the Jewish Sabbaths are not agreeable to the Lord, but Sundays are (c. 15); in place of the destroyed Jewish temple appears a spiritual temple (c. 16).

[4] Samuel, the little, is said to have composed it at the instigation of R. Gamaliel in Jafne, where the Sanhedrim met after the destruction of Jerusalem (Talmud. Hierosol. et Babylon. in tract. Berachoth). Hence this Gamaliel cannot be the elder Gamaliel, but his grandson. Cf. Vitringa de synagog. vet., p. 1047. Respecting the name מִינִים, see Fulleri miscellan. theologic., lib. ii., c. 3. G. E. Edzardus in not. ad Avoda Sara., p. 253 ss. Hieronym. ep. 89, ad Augustin.: Usque hodie per totas Orientis synagogas inter Judaeos haeresis est, quae dicitur Minaeorum et a Pharisaeis nunc usque damnatur, quos vulgo Nazaraeos nuncupant, qui credunt in Christum, filium Dei, natum de virgine Maria, et eum dicunt esse, qui sub Pontio Pilato passus est et resurrexit: in quem et nos credimus, sed dum volunt et Judaei esse et Christiani, nec Judaei sunt nec Christiani.

[5] Hegesippus in Eusebii h. e., iii. 32: *ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν αἱρετικῶν κατηγοροῦσί τινες Συμεῶνος τοῦ* Κλωπᾶ, *ὡς ὄντος ἀπὸ Δαβὶδ καὶ Χρισιανοῦ.* These heretics can only have been the adherents of the seven Jewish *αἱρέσεις*, of which Hegesippus in Euseb. ii. 23, and iv. 22, speaks. In the chronographia of Jo. Malala (about 600—ed. Oxon., 1691, 8vo., p. 356) is the following Relatio Tiberiani, or relation of Tiberianus, a president of Palestine, communicated to Trajan, which, if it be genuine, must belong to this time: *Ἀπέκαμον τιμωρούμενος καὶ φωνεύων τοὺς Γαλιλαίους, τοὺς τοῦ δόγματος τῶν λεγομένων Χριστιανῶν, κατὰ τὰ ὑμέτερα θεσπίσματα· καὶ οὐ παύονται ἑαυτοὺς μηνύοντες εἰς τὸ ἀναιρεῖσθαι. Ὅθεν ἐκοπίασα τούτοις παραινῶν καὶ ἀπειλῶν, μὴ τολμᾷν αὐτοὺς μηνύειν μοι ὑπάρχοντας ἐκ τοῦ προειρημένου δόγματος· καὶ ἀποδιωκόμενοι οὐ παύονται. Θεσπίσαι μοι οὖν καταξιώσατε τὰ παριστάμενα τῷ ὑμετέρῳ κράτει τροπαιούχῳ.* But Dodwell dissertt. Cypr. diss. xi. § 23, and Tillemont, note 2, sur la persécut. de Trajan. (in the Mémoires ed Bruxelles. 8, tom. ii., p. ii., p. 433 s.) have sufficiently proved the spuriousness of this relation.

[6] Hegesippus, in Eusebius iii. 32, says that the church enjoyed a profound peace till the death of Symeon, till the time of Trajan, and continued to be *παρθένος καθαρὰ καὶ ἀδιάφθορος.* When he designates Thebuthis as the person who corrupted it (Euseb. iv. 22), the connection does not render it necessary to understand the death of James as the

the Nazareans[7] who remained stedfast in the apostolic faith, a party separated which held the Mosaic law to be binding in all cases, and Jesus to be the son of Joseph and Mary. To them the name *Ebionites* was afterwards for the most part applied; an appellation originally given by the Jews in derision, to the Christians generally.[8] A new party also arose among the Jewish

point of time at which Thebuthis appeared; and we must therefore refer to the point of time which was before announced in obvious terms. Least of all can the opinion of Schliemann (Clementinen, S. 460) be justified, according to which, iv. 22 should be understood of the first beginnings of heretical views immediately after the death of James; iii. 32 of the open breaking out of these heresies in the second century. The influence of a Thebuthis, because he was not a bishop, can only have been an open opposition. The first beginnings of heretical views among the Jewish Christians are to be found long before the death of James in the opponents of Paul. It is still more remarkable that Schliemann, p. 448 f., did not farther consider this point of time given by Hegesippus as that in which the sects arose, but places the separation of the Ebionites from the Nazareans in the year 136. Comp. my treatise on the Nazareans and Ebionites in Stäudlin's and Tzschirner's Archiv., iv., ii. 320. Θέβουθις, according to Credner (Einl. in d. N. T. i. ii. 619), is not a person, but a collective idea, chald. תיובתא, תיובא, opposition, reluctance, especially abhorrence of the stomach, nausea, hence vomitus, and then generally filth, dirt, much the same as σπιλάδες, Jude 12. *σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι*, 2 Peter ii. 13.

[7] Comp. Epiphanii haer. 29. According to c. 7, they lived at the time of Epiphanius, towards the end of the fourth century, in Beroea, in Syria, in Coele-Syria, in Decapolis about Pella, and in Cocabe in Basanitis (now a village, Cocab, between Damascus and Nablus, nearer the latter. See Burckhardt's travels, German edition, edited by Gesenius. p. 591).

[8] Origenes c. Cels. ii. init. Ἐβιωναῖοι *χρηματίζουσιν οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὡς Χριστὸν παραδεξάμενοι.* V. 61, *οἱ δικτοὶ Ἐβιωναῖοι, ἤτοι ἐκ παρθένου ὁμολογοῦντες ὁμοίως ἡμῖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἢ οὐχ οὕτω γεγενῆσθαι, ἀλλ' ὡς τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀνθρώπους.* C. 65, Ἐβιωναῖοι *ἀμφότεροι.* These two classes cannot, as Schliemann supposes, be the Gnostic and the common Ebionites. He has himself shown, p. 207, that the former could not think of a birth of Christ by a virgin; Origen also calls them Elcesaites; see below, note 10. They are the Nazareans and Ebionites whom even Eusebius, h. e., iii. 27, groups together under the common appellation Ebionites, and at the same time obviously draws a distinction between them. The Ebionites, in a stricter sense, arose, according to Epiphanius haer. xxx. 2, at Cocabe, and lived in his day (l. c. c. 18), in Nabathea, Paneas, Moalitis, and Cocabe. Respecting their adherents in Asia Minor, Rome, and Cyprus, of which he also speaks, see below, note 10. The derivation of the name from one Ebion, occurs first in Tertullian de praescript. haeret., c. 33. In the Talmud. Hierosolymit. tract. Joma, fol. 4, col. 3, appears no אֶבְיוֹן, as Lightfoot parergon de excid. urbis,

Christians about the time of Trajan, in the countries lying eastward of the Dead Sea, by means of the diffusion of Essenism, which united with the asceticism of the Essenes the peculiar opinion, that the Spirit of God associated himself differently with one man, that, as the true prophet (Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Jesus), he might announce the same truth, and restore it when obscured.[9] This party became known

Opp. t. ii., p. 148, asserts, but a ר' אבהו. Comp. my treatise, p. 297 ff. 306 ff.

[9] Comp. Credner über Essäer u. Ebioniten, and a communication which partly agrees with his treatise in Winer's Zeitschrift f. wissensch. Theol. i. 211, 277. A. Schliemann's die Clementinen nebst den Verwandten Schriften, und der Ebionitismus. Hamburg, 1844. According to Epiphanius the Ἐσσηνοί (haer. x.) lived in Samaria; on the other hand, the Ὀσσηνοί (haer. xix.) in Nabathea, Iturea, Moabitis, and Areilitis. Hence he takes the former as a Samaritan, the latter as a Jewish sect. Doubtless the names were different merely by provincial pronunciation. The Essenes had withdrawn into these districts during the Jewish wars, in order to avoid the importunity of the Jews insisting on their carrying arms along with them. To the Ossenes, i.e. the Essenes living to the east of the Dead Sea, Ἠλξαΐ, Ἠλξαῖος attached himself in the reign of Trajan (Epiphan. haer. xix. 1), and remains of the party which he modified were still existing in the time of Epiphanius as a Christian sect, under the name of Σαμψαῖοι, living in Nabathea and Moabitis (l. c. c. 2), also in Iturea. They were also called Ἐλκεσαῖοι (haer. liii. 1); and by Origen (in Euseb. h. e. vi. 38) Ἐλκεσαΐται. That Elxai also attached himself to the Ebionites, and a part of them followed him (Epiphan. haer. xxx. 3). Epiphanius professes even to have read the prophetic book left by Elxai (haer. xix. 1, 3); and he had heard besides of another writing, belonging to a brother of Elxai (haer. liii. 3) called Ἰεξέος (haer. xix. 1). The name Ἠλξαΐ signified, according to his followers, δύναμις κεκαλυμμένη, from חַיִל and כְּסֶה (haer. xix. 2). Modern writers have conjectured that this name first originated from the name of the party, and have declared the name Elcesaite equivalent to אַלְבָּחִשִׁין (from כחשׁ, to deny), apostate. Baumgarten's Geschich. der Religionsparteien. p. 271; from אֵל שַׁדַּי Nitzsch de Testamentis xii. patriarcharum, p. 5. According to Scaliger, Ἐλξαΐ אֵל חַסְאִי ὁ Ἐσσαῖος (Petavii comm. ad Epiphan. haer. xix.) According to Delitzsch (in Rudelbach's and Guerike's Zeitschrift, 1841, i. 43), the Elcesaites derived their name from the town Elcesi, in Galilee. I believe that כְּסֵי חַיִל is an appellation of the Spirit of God which made the true prophet, and which is also called in the Clementine's hom. xvii. 16 δύναμις ἄσαρκος. The Elcesaites praised this secret power as their teacher; hence arose the error of Epiphanius. If the title of the work which he

beyond their own country by means of the *Clementines* towards the end of the second century;[10] and they were called sometimes *Elcesaites* or *Sampsaeans*, sometimes *Ebionites;* which latter was the general appellation of heretical Jewish Christians.

possessed was חֵיל כְּסָי, and he heard of another יָהּ כְּסָי, the latter treating of the concealed deity as the former did of his concealed power, he may have made out of this two brothers. That this development proceeded from a confounding of the Essenes with Jewish Christians is shown by Credner l. c. p. 312. When Schliemann denies this, because the similarity of the Essene creed to the Elcesaite cannot be demonstrated, he forgets that the former is completely unknown to us, since it was guarded as a mysterious doctrine under the sanction of an oath, a thing which the Elcesaites had also to do (Credner's Beiträge zur Einl. in d. bibl. Schriften i. 369). When Schliemann, on the other hand, designates this tendency as Gnostic Ebionitism, no objection can be made to the assertion, if Gnosis be taken as synonymous with theosophy generally. In this sense the Essenes, too, were Gnostics. But that theosophy which is in historical possession of the name Gnosis was opposed by the Elcesaites, as Schliemann, p. 539, himself shows. When moreover this same writer refers to the incorporation of the old oriental elements into Judaism, in order to explain Gnostic Ebionitism, and quotes Neander, he lays claim to the same source for it as that from which Neander derives Essenism (see above § 15, note 9). Regarding the name of the party, I do not believe with Credner (Beiträge. S. 367) that Ossenes, Sampsaeans, and Elcesaites were the names of the three highest classes of the Essenes. The Ossenes were the Essenes east of the Dead Sea, who by degrees became Christians. These Essene Christians were styled Elcesaites from the חֵיל כְּסָי, which they confessed; Sampsaeans (Epiphan. haer. liii. 2. Σαμψαῖοι ἑρμηνεύονται Ἡλιακοί from שֶׁמֶשׁ), probably because they turned while praying towards the rising sun, as did the Essenes. The name Ebionites which was given to them, if we may rely on the authority of Epiphanius, is with him the general appellation for all heretical Jewish Christians, and is therefore least of all adapted for a strict description.

[10] See below § 58. From this time onward the party appears to have obtained adherents in Asia Minor, Rome, and Cyprus. Hence Origen, in Euseb. h. c. vi. 38, distinguishes the αἵρεσιν τῶν Ἑλκεσαϊτῶν as νεωστὶ ἐπανισταμένην. On the other hand, it is very doubtful whether the doctrine of this party be represented in its pure unadulterated form in the Clementines.

111879

§ 33.

EXTERNAL FORTUNES OF THE CHRISTIANS IN THE OTHER PROVINCES OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

After the destruction of Jerusalem, the heathen Christians were everywhere so numerous that it was no longer possible to mistake the distinction between Christianity and Judaism. Still however the Christians were looked upon as a Jewish sect.[1] All the prejudices entertained against the Jews, and the hatred of the heathen which had been strengthened against them since their rebellion, were transferred in like manner to the Christians. At the same time Christianity appeared far more dangerous than Judaism, inasmuch as it was not confined, like it, to one people, but propagated itself everywhere with immense rapidity.[2] Yet the persecutions which the Christians had to suffer from individual emperors, were only partial. *Vespasian* (70—79), did not at all persecute the Christians as such; although they may have been harassed under his reign and that of *Titus* his successor, (79—81), by the demand of the tax imposed on every Jew. This was still more the case under *Domitian*, (81—96),[3]

[1] Hence in Tacitus (hist. v. 5), while describing the Jews, traits appear which are manifestly borrowed from the Christians: Animas proelio aut suppliciis peremptorum aeternas putant. Hinc generandi amor et moriendi contemptus.

[2] Notions of this time concerning the Christians: Tacit. annal. xv. 44: quos per flagitia invisos, vulgus Christianos appellabat. Auctor nominis ejus Christus, Tiberio imperitante, per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat. Repressaque in praesens exitiabilis superstitio rursus erumpebat non modo per Judaeam, originem ejus mali, sed per Urbem etiam, quo cuncta undique atrocia aut pudenda confluunt celebranturque. Odio humani generis convicti sunt. Sueton. in Nerone, c. 16: Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novae ac maleficae.

[3] The δίδραχμος now to be paid to Jupiter Capitolinus. Joseph. de B. J. vii. 6, 6. Sueton. in Domitiano, c. 12, Praeter caeteros Judaicus fiscus acerbissime actus est: ad quem deferebantur, qui vel improfessi Judaicam viverent vitam, vel dissimulata origine imposita genti tributa non pependissent. Interfuisse me adolescentulum memini, quum a procuratore frequentissimoque consilio inspiceretur nonagenarius senex, an circumsectus esset. Petri Zornii historia fisci Judaici sub imperio vett. Roman. Alton., 1734.

who caused some Christians to be put to death even in Rome,[4] and search to be made in Palestine for the posterity of David.[5] Under *Nerva* (96—98), all these provocations ceased.[6] At the time of *Trajan* (98—117), appear the first traces of that popular rage against them to which in succeeding times so many must frequently have fallen sacrifices (Eusebius iii. 32). *Pliny* the younger, governor of Bithynia, where the number of Christians had unusually increased, applied against them the general laws which had been lately revived by Trajan against *forbidden societies (hetaeriae)* which were really dangerous, *(cf. Plin. epist.* x. 42, 43; 110 *or* 111 A.D.) He adopted that course because no special laws had been enacted with regard to them. His account of the Christians addressed to Trajan, which is of the highest importance towards understanding their condition at that period, led to the first legal enactment relative to the course which should be adopted,[7] to which among

[4] Xiphilini epitome Dionis Cass. lxvii. 14: τὸν Φάβιον Κλήμεντα ὑπατεύοντα, καίπερ ἀνεψιὸν ὄντα, καὶ γυναῖκα καὶ αὐτὴν συγγενῆ ἑαυτοῦ Φλαβίαν Δομιτίλλαν ἔχοντα κατέσφαξεν ὁ Δομιτιανός· ἐπηνέχθη δὲ ἀμφοιν ἔγκλημα ἀθεότητος· ὑφ' ἧς καὶ ἄλλοι ἐς τὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἤθη ἐξοκέλλοντες πολλοὶ κατεδικάσθησαν· καὶ οἱ μὲν ἀπέθανον, οἱ δὲ τῶν γοὺν οὐσιῶν ἐστερήθησαν. ἡ δὲ Δομιτίλλα ὑπερωρίσθη μόνον εἰς Πανδατέρειαν. (ἄθεος, i.e. ὁ μὴ σεβόμενος τοὺς θεούς). Euseb. chron. lib. ii. ad Olymp. 218: Πολλοὶ δὲ Χριστιανῶν ἐμαρτύρησαν κατὰ Δομετιανὸν, ὡς ὁ Βρέττιος (Hieron. Brutius. Chron. pasch. ὁ Βρούττιος) ἱστορεῖ, ἐν οἷς καὶ Φλαυία Δομετίλλα, ἐξαδελφὴ Κλήμεντος Φλαυίου ὑπατικοῦ, ὡς χριστιανὴ εἰς νῆσον Ποντίαν φυγαδεύεται· αὐτός τε Κλήμης ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ ἀναιρεῖται. Cf. Ejusd. hist. eccl. iii. c. 18, § 2. According to Hieronymi epist. 86 (al. 27) ad Eustochium Virg. epitaphium Paulae matris, Paula had seen on the island Pontia the little cells in quibus illa (Flavia Domitilla) longum martyrium duxerat.

[5] As Vespasian had already done (Hegesipp. ap. Euseb. iii. 12), Hegesippus, in Euseb. iii. 20, relates how the grandchildren of Judas, the brother of Christ, were brought before Domitian.

[6] Xiphilini epit. Dionis. lxviii. 1: ὁ Νερούας τούς τε χρινομένους ἐπ' ἀσεβείᾳ ἀφῆκε, καὶ τοὺς φεύγοντας κατήγαγε· τοῖς δὲ δὴ ἄλλοις οὔτ' ἀσεβείας, οὔτ' Ἰουδαϊκοῦ βίου καταιτιᾶσθαί τινας συνεχώρησε. A coin of the senate: Fisci Judaici calumnia sublata. S. Eckhel doctrina nummor. veter. vi., p. 405.

[7] Plinii lib. x. epist. 96 (al. 97): C. Plinius Trajano. Solemne est mihi, Domine, omnia, de quibus dubito, ad Te referre. Quis enim potest melius vel cunctationem meam regere, vel ignorantiam instruere? Cognitionibus de Christianis interfui nunquam: ideo nescio, quid et quatenus aut puniri soleat, aut quaeri. Nec mediocriter haesitavi, sitne aliquod discrimen aetatum, an quamlibet teneri nihil a robustioribus differant: deturne poenitentiae venia, an ei, qui omnino Christianus fuit, desisse non prosit: nomen ipsum, si flagitiis careat, an flagitia cohaeren-

others, Ignatius also, bishop of Antioch, (116), fell a sacrifice.[8]

tia nomini puniantur. Interim in iis, qui ad me tanquam Christiani deferebantur, hunc sum secutus modum. Interrogavi ipsos, an essent Christiani: confitentes iterum ac tertio interrogavi, supplicium minatus: perseverantes duci jussi. Neque enim dubitabam, qualecunque esset quod faterentur, pertinaciam certe et inflexibilem obstinationem debere puniri. Fuerunt alii similis amentiae: quos, quia cives Romani erant, annotavi in urbem remittendos. Mox ipso tractatu, ut fieri solet, diffundente se crimine, plures species inciderunt. Propositus est libellus sine auctore, multorum nomina continens, qui negarent, esse se Christianos aut fuisse. Cum praeeunte me Deos appellarent, et imagini Tuae, quam propter hoc jusseram cum simulacris numinum afferri, thure ac vino supplicarent, praeterea maledicerent Christo, quorum nihil cogi posse dicuntur, qui sunt revera Christiani, dimittendos esse putavi. Alii ab indice nominati, esse se Christianos dixerunt, et mox negaverunt: fuisse quidem, sed desisse, quidam ante triennium, quidam ante plures annos, non nemo etiam ante viginti quoque. Omnes et imaginem Tuam, Deorumque simulacra venerati sunt: ii et Christo maledixerunt. Affirmabant autem, hanc fuisse summam vel culpae suae, vel erroris, quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem: seque sacramento, non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent; quibus peractis morem sibi discedendi fuisse, rursusque coëundi ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innoxium (not singularem maleficae superstitionis); quod ipsum facere desisse post edictum meum, quo secundum mandata Tua hetaerias esse vetueram. Quo magis necessarium credidi, ex duabus ancillis, quae ministrae dicebantur, quid esset veri, et per tormenta quaerere. Sed nihil aliud inveni, quam superstitionem pravam et immodicam: ideoque dilata cognitione ad consulendum Te decurri. Visa est enim mihi res digna consultatione, maxime propter periclitantium numerum. Multi enim omnis aetatis, omnis ordinis, utriusque sexus etiam, vocantur in periculum, et vocabuntur. Neque enim civitates tantum, sed vicos etiam atque agros superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est. Quae videtur sisti et corrigi posse. Certe satis constat, prope jam desolata templa coepisse celebrari, et sacra solemnia diu intermissa repeti, pastumque venire victimarum, cujus adhuc rarissimus emtor inveniebatur. Ex quo facile est opinari, quae turba hominum emendari possit, si sit poenitentiae locus.

Ibid. ep. 97 (al. 98): Trajanus Plinio. Actum, quem debuisti, mi Secunde, in excutiendis causis eorum, qui Christiani ad te delati fuerant, secutus es. Neque enim in universum aliquid, quod quasi certam formam habeat, constitui potest. Conquirendi non sunt: si deferantur et arguantur, puniendi sunt, ita tamen, ut qui negaverit se Christianum esse, idque re ipsa manifestum fecerit, i.e. supplicando Diis nostris, quamvis suspectus in praeteritum, veniam ex poenitentia impetret. Sine auctore vero propositi libelli in nullo crimine locum habere debent: nam et pessimi exempli, nec nostri seculi est. (This text is after the edition of J. C. Orelli, prefixed to the Zürich Lectionscatalogc. Mich.,

§ 34.

REGULATIONS OF THE CHURCH.

Of the apostles we find at this time only *Philip* in Hierapolis, *(Polycrates ap. Euseb. h. e.* iii. 31 and v. 24,*)* and *John*[1] in

1838.) Even Tertullian (apologet., c. 2) and Eusebius (hist. eccl., iii. 33) mention these letters. Against the doubts of Gibbon, Semler, and Corodi, concerning their genuineness, see H. C. Haversaat's Vertheidigung der Plinischen Briefe über die Christen. Göttingen, 1788. 8., and Gierig, in his edition of Plinii epist., tom. ii. (Lips. 1802), p. 498 ss. Against Dr J. Held prolegomena ad librum epistt. quas mutuo sibi scripsisse Plinium jun. et Trajanum Caes. viri docti credunt (Schweidnitz, 1835, 4.), who looks upon the entire tenth book as a forgery, see the Munich gel. Anz., Sept. 1836. No. 186. Commentaries on these epistles are in: Franc. Balduini comm. ad edicta veterum principum Rom. de Christianis. Basil. s. a. (and appended to his Constantinus Magnus, Lips. 1727), p. 26—69. Just. Henn. Boehmeri xii. dissertatt. juris eccles. ant. ad Plin. sec. et Tertullianum. ed. 2. Halae, 1729. Gierig l. c.

[8] Euseb. h. e. iii. 36. Trajan's conduct towards Ignatius is not inexplicable, as Baur (Ursprung des Episcopats. S. 149) supposes, but was well considered. He sent him to be executed at Rome, partly for the sake of not provoking the fanaticism of the Christians at Antioch, by looking upon his martyrdom; partly because he thought that the tedious hardships endured on the way to the place of execution might effect a change of mind, for the apostacy of this head of the Christians must have been of the greatest consequence; partly for the purpose of terrifying the Christians on the way when they saw the sufferer. Among the various texts of the Acta martyrii Ign., that of the old Latin version is the most ancient (Cotelerii patr. apost., ii. 171); the Greek is (l. c. p. 161) a revision, which first proceeded, perhaps, from Simeon Metaphrastes. Both may also be found in Ruinart acta mart. selecta.

[1] John's exile to Patmos, an inference from Apoc. i. 9. Clemens Alex. quis dives salvetur c. 42. cf. Tertull. de praescr. haer. 36: apostolus Johannes posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur. That he drank off a poison-cup without injury (as Justus Barsabas after Papias ap. Euseb. iii. 39, comp. Mark xvi. 18) is first related by Augustin in soliloquiis. cf. Fabricii cod. apocr. N. T. ii. 576. Thilo acta Thomae, in the notitia uber. p. 73. Tradition gave rise to the fabrication of the story concerning the cup and the baptism, that Matth. xx. 23 might be fulfilled. His death was under Trajan (Iren. ii. 29, iii. 3), according to Euseb. chron. and Hieron. catal. c. 9, in the third year of Trajan, 100 A.D. Traditions growing out of John xxi. 22: the one, that John placed himself alive in the grave, and is only sleeping in it, Fabric. l. c. p. 588, Thilo. l. c. lxxiv.; the other,

Ephesus. While the latter superintended the churches of Asia Minor, and laid the foundation of a peculiar development of doctrine, by instructing able disciples and by his writings; the churches of other countries lost that superintendence which they had hitherto enjoyed, by the death of the apostles and their immediate disciples. The want of unity required something to compensate for it, and this was presented in *the episcopate*[2]

that he was translated like Enoch and Elias. Pseudo-Hippolytus de consummat. mundi (in Hippol. opp. ed. Fabricius, append. p. 14) and Ephraemius Antioch. about 526 (in Photii bibl. cod. 229, ed. Rothomag. p. 798 ss.)—Surnames: virgo, παρθένος (so ran at first the subscription to the first and second epistles of John: ἐπιστ. Ἰωαννου τοῦ παρθένου. The Latins, afterwards misunderstanding it, made out of it Epistolam ad Parthos), after the council of Nice especially θεολόγος.—Credner's Einl. in d. N. T. i. i. 217.

[2] Comp. § 30, not. 1. Hilarius Diaconus (usually called Ambrosiaster) about 380 in comment. ad 1 Tim. iii. 10: episcopi et presbyteri una ordinatio est. Uterque enim sacerdos est; sed episcopus primus est; ut omnis episcopus presbyter sit, non tamen omnis presbyter episcopus: hic enim espiscopus est, qui inter presbyteros primus est. The traces of this relation were longest preserved in Alexandria. Hieronym. epist. 101 (al. 85) ad Evangelum (in the old editions falsely styled ad Evagrium, also in Gratianus dist. xciii. c. 24): apostolus perspicue docet eosdem esse presbyteros, quos episcopos.—Quaeris auctoritatem? Audi testimonium. Then Phil. i. 1, Acts xx. 28, &c., are cited. Quod autem postea unus electus est, qui caeteris praeponeretur, in schismatis remedium factum est, ne unusquisque ad se trahens Christi ecclesiam rumperet. Nam et Alexandriae a Marco evangelista usque ad Heraclam et Dionysium episcopos (about 240 A.D.) presbyteri semper unum ex se selectum, in excelsiori gradu collocatum, episcopum nominabant. Quomodo si exercitus imperatorem faciat, aut diaconi eligant de se, quem industrium noverint, et archidiaconum vocent, (comp. on this letter Chr. Waechtler, acta eruditorum ann. 1717, p. 484 ss. 524 ss. With a Catholic bias P. Molkenbuhr, and after him Binterim Denkwürdigk. d. christkath. Kirche ii. i. 78 ff., have pronounced the letter spurious). Hilarius Diac. comm. ad Ephes. iv. 11: primum presbyteri episcopi appellabantur, ut uno recedente sequens ei succederet. Denique apud Aegyptum presbyteri consignant, si praesens non sit episcopus. Sed quia coeperunt sequentes presbyteri indigni inveniri ad primatus tenendos, immutata est ratio, prospiciente concilio, ut non ordo, sed meritum crearet episcopum, multorum sacerdotum judicio constitutum, ne indignus temere usurparet, et esset multis scandalum.—Pseudo-Augustini (probably also Hilarii Diaconi) quaestiones vet. et nov. testamenti (in the appendix tom. iii. p. ii. of the Benedictine edition), quaest. 101: presbyterum autem intelligi episcopum probat Paulus apostolus, quando Timotheum, quem ordinavit presbyterum, instruit, qualem debeat creare episcopum (1 Tim. iii. 1). Quid est enim episcopus, nisi primus presbyter, hoc est summus sacerdos?—Nam in Alexandria et per totam Aegyptum, si desit episcopus, consecrat [Ms.

which had been adumbrated for a considerable time in the mother-church of Jerusalem, by the position of *James* and his suc-

Colb. consignat] presbyter. In like manner, Eutychius (Said Ibn Batrik about 930) patriarcha Alex. in Ecclesiae suae origg. (ed. Joh. Selden p. 29): constituit Marcus evangelista xii. presbyteros, qui nempe manerent cum patriarcha, adeo ut cum vacaret patriarchatus. eligerent unum e xii. presbyteris, cujus capiti reliqui xi. manus imponerent, eique benedicerent, et patriarcham eum crearent (comp. 1 Tim. iv. 14).—Neque desiit Alexandriae institutum hoc de presbyteris, ut scilicet patriarchas crearent ex presbyteris duodecim, usque ad tempora Alexandri patriarchae Alexandrini, qui fuit ex numero illo cccxviii. Is autem vetuit, ne deinceps patriarcham presbyteri crearent. Et decrevit, ut mortuo patriarcha convenirent episcopi, qui patriarcham ordinarent. In this account the part, at least, which contradicts the later discipline has certainly not been interpolated in later times, (but still Guilelmus Autissiodorensis about 1206 comm. ad sent. l. iv. qu. 1, de sacram. ord. sub finem, says: Quod si non essent in mundo nisi tres simplicis sacerdotes, oporteret quod aliquis illorum consecraret alium in episcopum etalium in archiepiscopum), and so far it has a historical value. Attempts to remove from the passage what is offensive to preconceived opinions have been made by Morin, Pearson, Le Quien, Renaudot, Petavius, especially by Abrah. Echellensis, Eutychius patriarcha Alex. vindicatus et suis restitutus orientalibus, s. responsio ad Jo. Seldeni origines, &c. Romae 1661, 4. Mamachii origg. et antiquitt. Christian. Tom. iv. p. 503 ss. See on the contrary sides, J. F. Rehkopf vitae patriarcharum Alexandrinorum saec. i. et ii. Specim. iii. (Lips. 1759, 4), p. 28 s.—On the accounts of Jerome and Hilary rests the usual Protestant view of the origin of episcopacy, which is developed among the moderns, (for the older literature see § 30, note 1), with different modifications by Ziegler Gesch. d. Kirchl. Verfassungsformen p. 7. Gabler de episcopis primae eccl. Christ. eorumque origine diss. Jenae 1805, 4to. Neander K. G. i. i. 324. Episcopacy is said to have been established as a point of union between the ἐκκλησίαι κατ' οἶκον, which may have stood independently of each other in towns, (see § 30, note 6), by J. F. Gruner de origine episcoporum exerc. Halae 1764, 4to. Münscher Dogmengeschichte ii. 376, and especially by N. Chr. Kist. über den Ursprung der bisch. Gewalt (in Illgen's Zeitschrift für d. hist. Theol. ii. ii. 47). See on the other side Rothe die Anfänge d. christl. Kirche und ihrer Verfassung i. 194. According to Rothe (p. 392) episcopacy was introduced as an instrument of Christian unity by the still remaining apostles at the council of Jerusalem, at which they chose Symeon bishop of Jerusalem (Euseb. iii. 11). But when the memory of this synod is preserved how can its most important transaction be forgotten? According to Baur, (uber d. Ursprung des Episkopats. Tübingen 1838, 8.), the heresies which first appeared in full power under the Antonines which brought the idea of the catholic church into a clear point of view, gave rise to the outward manifestation of this idea by establishing the episcopate, which was looked upon as a matter of pressing necessity. The Petrine and Pauline parties were united on this point; and in the endeavour to realise the mea-

cessors.[3] This example was imitated, especially in the neighbouring churches, at *Antioch* in particular.[4] It is true, that in the more remote churches, the chief presbyters, as presidents of the college of presbyters, occupied a similar position; but they had not been as yet elevated above the other presbyters by independent privileges peculiar to themselves.[5] Ignatius, through the instrumentality of his epistles, recommended episcopacy universally, as a condition of unity, and that too in the most urgent terms;[6] and, thus the first presbyters soon generally moved up

sure, the influence of the Clementines, which proceeded from the Petrine party, as well as the acts of the apostles, the pastoral epistles, and the later Ignatian letters, which now proceeded from the Pauline party, were working in the one direction.

[3] See above, § 26, note 4. § 32, note 2.

[4] Comp. the epistles of Ignatius, Rothe Anfänge d. christl. Kirche i. 467. It is worthy of notice, that the bishop is always here represented as Christ's representative; the presbyters as the representatives of the apostles (ad Trallianos c. 2: *τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὑποτάσσεσθε ὡς Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ,—ὑποτάσσεσθε καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, ὡς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.* cf. c. 3, ad Magnes. c. 6, ad Smyrn. c. 8); whereas, according to the view which soon after prevailed in the church, the bishops are the successors and representatives of the apostles. The Ignatian apprehension of this relation appears to have had its origin in Jerusalem, where James, the brother of Jesus, might be reckoned the representative of the latter; and in like manner, the other relatives of Jesus who were subsequently chosen presidents by the churches in Palestine, see § 52, note 2.

[5] Clemens Rom. in epist. i. ad Corinth, c. 42, names only *ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διάκονοι*, and finds these two classes of the clergy prophetically announced as early as Isaiah lx. 17. Hermae pastor. i. vis. ii. 4. Seniores, qui praesunt ecclesiae. Vis. iii. 5: Apostoli, et episcopi, et doctores, et ministri. Here the bishops are the seniores, the doctores, the teaching presbyters and evangelists, and not as Rothe, p. 408, supposes, the presbyters merely. Polycarp. ad Philipp. c. 5: admonishes, *ὑποτάσσεσθαι τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνοις, ὡς τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Χριστῷ.* Polycarp designates himself as president among the presbyters in the beginning of the epistle: *Πολύκαρπος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβύτεροι τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ παροικούσῃ Φιλίπποις κ. τ. λ.*

[6] Ignatius recommends submission to the episcopal authority, as something new, or at least not yet sufficiently settled, see Kist in Illgen's Zeitschrift ii. ii. 68. In his epist. ad Polycarpum he addresses the latter as *ἐπίσκοπον* different from the *πρεσβυτέροις* (c. 6), and exhorts him to the exercise of his episcopal rights and duties; although Polycarp himself, in his epistle written not long afterwards, designates himself merely as the principal presbyter, (see note 5). Thus Ignatius represents the first presbyters of the churches as bishops, and wishes to induce them to appropriate the idea of the episcopate. Thus he addresses Onesimus as bishop of Ephesus (ep. ad Ephes. c. 1), Polybius as bishop of Tralles (ad

to the higher step as ἐπίσκοποι,[7] although they retained besides for a long time the title πρεσβύτεροι.[8] When the attempt was made at a later period to carry up the series of bishops, as the successors of the apostles, to the apostles themselves, the most distinguished presbyters of the earlier times were selected to be the first bishops.[9] In this way we explain the different accounts of the order of the first Romish bishops.[10] The universal right to teach in the public assemblies having occasioned impropriеties very early, (James iii. 1), it seems to have been already in this period limited by custom to those officers who publicly spoke in the congregation, although it was not formally abolished.[11a]

Trall. c. 12), Dumas as bishop of Magnesia (ad Magnes. c. 2), and an unknown person as bishop of Philadelphia (ad. Philadelph. c. 1).

[7] The πρωτοστώς, who, in Justini apol. maj. c. 65, is supposed to be in all churches, is doubtless the bishop.

[8] Because they always possessed as yet the character of the presiding presbyter. Thus the bishops are included among the πρεσβυτέροις in Irenaeus iii. 2, 2, (successiones presbyterorum; on the other hand, iii. 3, 1 and 2, successiones episcoporum), iv. 26, 2, 3, 5, v. 20, 2. In Irenaei epist. ad Victorem ap. Euseb. v. 24, the earlier bishops are called οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, οἱ προστάντες τῆς ἐκκλησιας. Tertullianus in apologet. c. 39, calls bishops and presbyters together, seniores.

[9] In Alexandria: (Marcus) Annianus, Abilius, Kerdon (Euseb. ii. 24, iii. 14, 21). In Antioch: Evodius, Ignatius, Heros (Euseb. iii. 22, 36).

[10] Comp. § 27, note 6. First of all, Irenaeus adv. haer. iii. 3, followed by Eusebius iii. 2, 13, 14, 31, gives it thus: Linus (2 Tim. iv. 21?) † 80, Anencletus, Anacletus or Cletus † 92, Clemens (Philipp. iv. 3?) † 102, Evarestus † 110. According to the Clementines, on the contrary, Clement, the constant attendant of Peter, was consecrated by that apostle bishop of Rome. This opinion is followed by Tertullian de praescr. c. 32. Accordingly, the apostol. constitutt. vii. 46, give the following order: Linus nominated by Paul, Clement by Peter, &c. In like manner, Optatus Milev. de schism. Donatist. ii. 2. Augustini ep. 53, ad Generosum. On the other hand, Epiphanius xxvii. 6, represents Clement as ordained bishop by Peter, but not as having entered on his office till after the death of Linus and Anacletus. Rufinus praef. in recognit. says that Linus and Cletus were bishops in the lifetime of Peter; and that after the death of the latter, Peter appointed Clement shortly before his own death. According to Jerome, (catal. c. 15), most of the Latins looked upon Clement as the immediate successor of Peter. The modern Romish church assumes the following order: Peter, Linus, Clemens, Cletus, Anacletus, Evarestus. Comp. Jo. Pearsonii and Henr. Dodwelli diss. de successione primorum Romae episcoporum, in Pearsonii opp. posthum. Lond. 1688, 4. J. Ph. Baraterii disquisitio chronol. de successione antiquissima episcoporum Rom. Ultraj. 1740, 4.

[11] Dr K. F. W. Paniel's pragm. Gesch. d. christl. Beredsamkeit u. d. Homiletik. Bd. 1. Abth. 1. (Leipzig 1839) p. 75.

§ 35.

APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

SS. Patrum, qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt, opera ed. J. B. Cotelerius. Paris. 1672. recud. curavit J. Clericus ed. 2. Amst. 1724. 2 voll. fol. SS. Patrum apostolic. opera genuina ed. Rich. Russel. Lond. 1746. 2 voll. 8. S. Clementis Rom., S. Ignatii, S. Polycarpi, patrum apostt., quae supersunt. Accedunt S. Ignatii et S. Polycarpi martyria. Ad fidem codd. rec., adnotationibus illustravit, indicibus instruxit Guil. Jacobson. 2 tomi. Oxon. 1838. ed. 2. 1840. 8. Patrum apostt. opera (genuina). Textum recognovit, brevi adnotatione instruxit, et in usum praell. acadd. ed. C. J. Hefele. Tubingae 1839. ed. 2. 1843.

Apostolic fathers is a title given to those who were the immediate and genuine disciples of the apostles, and in a stricter sense, to such of them as have left works behind. To the school of Paul belong *Barnabas* (comp. § 26)[1] *Clement of Rome*,

[1] The epistle of Barnabas, which was regarded even by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Jerome, as genuine, remained entirely unknown till after Ussher's edition had been burnt in the printing-office at Oxford, 1643. It was first published by Hugo Menardus, Paris, 1645, 4to, and with a corrected text by Iss. Vossius appended to the epistles of Ignatius, Amstel. 1646, 4to. For a long time the predominant opinion was against its authenticity, see especially Tentzel ad Hieron. catal. cap. 6, in Fabricii bibl. eccles. p. 38 ss. Yet Isaac Vossius, Cave, Grynaeus, Gallandius, declared it genuine. Since J. E. Chr. Schmidt K. G. 437 Münscher Dogmengesch. i. 111, Rosenmüller hist. interpret. libb. sacr. i. 42, decided in its favour, this became almost the prevailing opinion, and has been defended with ingenuity particularly by D. E. Henke. de epistolae, quae Barnabae tribuitur authentia, Jenae 1827, 8vo; Bleek Brief a. d. Hebräer i. 416; and J. Chr. Rördam comm. de authentia epist. Barnabae Partic. I. Hafn. 1828, 8vo. Gu. H. Haverkorn van Rysewyk diss. de Barnaba, Arnhemiae 1835, 8vo, has also declared in favour of the genuineness. Recently, however, certain important voices have been raised again in opposition to the epistle, as Neander (K. G. i. ii. 1133), Twesten (Dogmatik i. 104), Ullmann (theol. Studien u. Kritiken i. ii. 382), and Hug (Zeitschrift für d. Geistlichkeit d. Erzbisth Freiburg. ii. 132 ff.; iii. 208 ff.). Dan. Schenkel (über d. Brief d. Barn. in d. theol. Stud. u. Kritik. 1837, iii. 652) believes that § 1—6, 13, 14, 17, constitute the genuine original letter, and that § 7—12, 15, 16, were afterwards inserted by a therapeutic Jewish Christian. On the other hand, C. J. Hefele, in the Tübing. theol. Quartalschr. 1839, i. 50, affirms the integrity of the epistle, but denies the authenticity of it in the work entitled, "das Sendschreiben des Apostels Barnabas aufs neue untersucht,

(comp. § 34, not. 10),[2] to whom in later times many writings were falsely ascribed,[3] and *Hermas*, whose work (ἀποκάλυψις)[4]

übersetzt und erklärt, Tübingen, 1840, 8."—The chief ground urged against the genuineness, that the absurd mystical mode of interpretation could not have proceeded from a companion of the apostle Paul, seems to me untenable. That Barnabas was not a man of spiritual consequence, is clear even from the Acts of the apostles. There he is at first the more prominent by virtue of his apostolic commission, in company with Paul (Acts xi. 22; xii. 2. Barnabas and Saul), but he soon falls entirely into the background behind Paul, after a freer sphere of activity has commenced (xiii. 13, 43, Paul and Barnabas). The epistle was written soon after the destruction of Jerusalem, according to chapters iv. and xvi., and the ancient testimony of Clement, that Barnabas was the author, cannot be derived from a partiality of the Alexandrian in favour of a production of kindred spirit, because the millennarianism of the letter (c. 15) could not have pleased the Alexandrian, and besides, all the interpretations do not agree with Clement, who in his Paedag. ii. p. 221 refutes one of them, and in his Stromata ii. p. 464 prefers another view of Psalm i. 1 to that given in the epistle before us.

[2] His epistle to the Corinthians, which was usually read in the religious assemblies at Corinth, as early as the second century (Dionys. Corinth. in Euseb. h. e. iv. 23, 6. Iren. iii. 3), is called in question without reason by Semler (histor. Einleit. zu Baumgarten's Unters. theol. Streitigkeiten. Bd. 2. S. 16) and Ammon (Leben Jesu i. 33), but it has been looked upon as interpolated, by H. Bignon, Ed. Bernard, H. Burton, Jo. Clericus (see Patrum apost. Cotelerii ed. Clerici ii. p. 133, 478, 482, and in the notes to the letter) Ittig, Mosheim, and Neander. It seems to belong to the end of the first century. In opposition to Schenkel (theol. Studien und Krit. 1841, i. 65), who places it between 64 and 70, see Schliemann's Clementinen, p. 409. The so-called second epistle, a mere fragment, is spurious (Euseb. iii. 38). These two letters, preserved only in the Cod. Alexand., were first published by Patricius Junius, Oxon. 1633, 4to, and his incorrect text has been repeated in most editions. After a careful comparison of the MS., a more correct text was given first of all by Henr. Wotton, Cantabr. 1718.

[3] Namely, 1. Two letters in the Syriac language, see below § 73, Not. 5. 2. Constitutiones and Canones apostolorum, see § 67, Not. 3. Recognitiones Clementis and Clementina, see § 58.

[4] Partly an imitation of the 4th book of Ezra (see § 31, not. 3, comp. Jachmann, p. 63), it professes to be a writing of the Hermas mentioned in Romans xvi. 14 (lib. i. vis. ii. c. 4), and is quoted as Scriptura even by Irenaeus iv. 3. When the opposition to Montanism began in the west towards the end of the second century (see below § 59), it lost its reputation there with those who were inclined to montanist views, because it allowed a repentance once after baptism, and with the opponents of montanism it fell into disrepute, on account of its apocalyptic form (Tertull. de Pudic. c. 10: Cederem tibi, si scriptura pastoris, quae sola moechos amat, divino instrumento meruisset incidi, si non ab omni concilio ecclesiarum, etiam vestrarum, inter apocrypha et falsa judicaretur, c. 2: ille

inculcates moral precepts in visions and parables, in order to promote the completeness of the church. The disciples of John are *Ignatius*, bishop of Antioch, (see § 33, not. 8)[5] *Polycarp*,

apocryphus pastor moechorum), and now it is declared by the Fragmentum de canone in Muratorii antiquitt. Ital. iii. 853: Pastorem vero nuperrime temporibus nostris in urbe Roma Hermas conscripsit, sedente cathedra urbis Romae ecclesiae Pio episcopo, fratre ejus. This assumption, which Irenaeus cannot have known, became afterwards the usual one in the west. On the contrary, the work remained in repute among the Alexandrians, and is cited by Clement of Alex. and Origen frequently, by Athanasius several times as an authority (see Jachmann p. 37). Origenes in Ep. ad Rom. comm. lib. x. c. 31: Puto tamen, quod Hermas, iste (Rom. xvi. 14) sit scriptor libelli istius, qui Pastor appellatur, quae scriptura valde mihi utilis videtur, et, ut puto, divinitus inspirata. But when in later times the Arians appealed to it (Athanasii epist. ad Afros in Opp. i. ii. 895) its reputation sank in the Greek church also. Hieronymus in catal. c. 10: Herman, cujus apostolus Paulus ad Romanos scribens meminit,—asserunt auctorem esse libri, qui appellatur Pastor, et apud quasdam Graeciae ecclesias etiam publice legitur. Revera utilis liber, multique de eo scriptorum veterum usurpavere testimonia, sed apud Latinos paene ignotus est. Lücke Einl. in die Offenbarung Joh. p. 141, places it in the middle of the second century, Jachmann der Hirte des Hermas, Königsb. 1835, in the beginning of it, and regards the Hermas of Paul as the author.

[5] Seven epistles ad Smyrnaeos, ad Polycarpum, ad Ephesios, ad Magnesios, ad Philadelphienses, ad Trallianos, ad Romanos (Polycarp ep. c. 13, mentions the epistles of Ignatius in general, Iren. v. 28 cites that to the Romans, Origenes prol. in cant. cant. and Hom. vi. in Lucan those to the Romans and Ephesians; Eusebius iii. 36 mentions all the seven) are extant in a longer and in a shorter recension. (The latter was first published by Is. Vossius at Amstel. 1649, 4to.) The controversy concerning their genuineness was interwoven with that respecting the origin of Episcopacy. In the older literature, which is rich in notices of the epistles, the chief work in favour of the authenticity is: Jo. Pearson. vindiciae epistol. S. Ignatii, Cantabr. 1672, 4. The leading work against the authenticity is: Jo. Dallaeus de scriptis, quae sub Dionysii Areop. et Ignatii Antioch. nominibus circumferuntur. Genev. 1666, 4. Recently Rothe (Anfänge p. 715) defended the authenticity. But in opposition to him Baur (über die ursprung des Episkopats S. 148 ff.) asserted that these letters were composed at Rome in the second half of the second century, on the side of the pure Pauline Christianity against the Petrine Judaising tendency which had found expression in the Clementines. Dr J. E. Huther again defended the authenticity with reference to these doubts (Illgen's Zeitschrift für d. histor. Theol. 1841, iv. 1). As regards the two recensions, W. Whiston (primitive Christianity revived. Lond. 1711) is the only person who has declared the longer to be the original one; while Dr F. K. Maier (theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1836, ii. 340) is of opinion that it comes much nearer the original text. Against the latter see Rothe l. c. p. 739, and Arndt (theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1839, i. 136.) J. E.

bishop of Smyrna, († 167)[6] and *Papias*, bishop of Hierapolis[7] of whose writings nothing but fragments are extant. The compositions attributed to *Dionysius the Areopagite* (Acts xvii. 34) are spurious.[8]

Chr. Schmidt (in Henke's Magazin, iii. 91) thought that both recensions arose from a thorough revision of the genuine text, but yet he admitted (in his Biblioth. für Kritik. u. Exegese d. N. T. ii. 29) that the shorter comes nearest to the genuine text. Netz (theol. Stud. u. Kritik. 1835, iv. 881) has repeated the same opinion. Against him see Arndt (theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1839, i. 742). The latest investigations have all turned out in favour of the shorter recension (see Rothe, Arndt, Huther, ll. cc. F. A. Chr. Düsterdieck, quae de Ignatianarum epistolarum authentia, duorumque textuum ratione et dignitate hucusque prolatae sunt sententiae enarrantur et dijudicantur. Gottingae 1843, 4. Worthy of attention are the remarks of Arndt, S. 139, respecting the necessity of revising the text of the shorter recension after the best MSS. and other existing critical helps. Eight other pretended letters of Ignatius are certainly spurious. [See particularly "The ancient Syriac version of the epistles of St Ignatius to St Polycarp, the Ephesians, and the Romans; together with extracts from his epistles collected from the writings of Severus of Antioch, Timotheus of Alexandria, and others. Edited with an English translation and notes. Also the Greek text of these three epistles, corrected according to the authority of the Syriac version. By William Cureton, M.A., London, 1845, 8vo.]

[6] Epist. ad Philippenses, mentioned so early as by Irenaeus iii. 3 (ap. Euseb. iv. 14, 3), frequently, however, controverted by the opponents of the Ignatian epistles, doubted of by Semler and Rössler, and recently declared to be spurious by Schwegler (der Montanismus und d. christl. Kirche, Tübingen 1841, S. 260). On the other side, Schliemann's Clementinen, S. 418.

[7] Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστὴς, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἑταῖρος γεγονώς, Iren. v. 33, is said to have suffered martyrdom in 163, in Pergamus (Chronic. pasch. ed. Bonn. i. 481), wrote λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις. fragments in Grabe ii. p. 26. Routh i. p. 1. In Euseb. h. e. iii. 36 he is called: ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα ὅτι μάλιστα λογιώτατος, καὶ τῆς γραφῆς εἰδήμων (respecting the omission of these words in some MSS. after Rufin's example, see Kimmel de Rufino, p. 236). But because he expressed very gross millennarianism in his writings (although that doctrine was older), Eusebius passes a very severe judgment upon him, h. e. iii. 39: χιλιάδα τινά φησιν ἐτῶν ἔσεσθαι μετὰ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν, σωματικῶς τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ βασιλείας ἐπὶ ταυτησὶ τῆς γῆς ὑποστησομένης,—σφόδρα γάρ τοι σμικρὸς ὢν τὸν νοῦν.—πλὴν καὶ τοῖς μετ' αὐτὸν πλείστοις ὅσοις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τῆς ὁμοίας αὐτῷ δόξης παραίτιος γέγονε—ὥσπερ οὖν Εἰρηναίῳ κ. τ. λ. With what right Eusebius, who in his Chronicon (Olymp. 220) allows Papias without hesitation to have been a disciple of the apostle John, declares in this work that he was only the pupil of a certain presbyter John, is examined by Olshausen, die Echtheit der vier kanon. Evangelien. Königsb. 1823, S. 224 ff.

[8] Respecting them see below § 110, not. 4.

§ 36.

DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE IN THIS PERIOD.

While the stricter party of Jewish Christians maintained the Jewish prejudices, and therefore constantly endeavoured to impose on the Gentile Christians the observance of the Mosaic law,[1] that speculation which strove to comprehend Christianity in its peculiar nature was always becoming more powerful in other quarters. Inasmuch as a speculative basis was not yet firmly established, great freedom was allowed for it; but as soon as it trenched upon the moral and religious interests of Christianity, it was resisted, and not till then.[2] It was principally with the wonderful person of Christ, which it endeavoured to understand, that speculation fatigued itself. Even here the most different tendencies were indulged in, as long as they left unimpaired the divine and human in Christ, by the union of which the atoning and typical character of the life of Jesus was necessarily constituted. Hence, the *shepherd of Hermas* with its peculiar christology gave no offence.[3] On the contrary, the doc-

[1] Against this party is directed Epist. Barnabae, c. 1—16.

[2] Thus an error which threatened to turn Christian liberty into impudence is combated in the Epistle of Jude, which was written after the destruction of Jerusalem (Credner's Einl. in d. N. T. i. ii. 611), and in the 2d Epistle of Peter, which is an imitation of that of Jude (Credner, i. ii. 650). The false teachers mentioned in the latter epistle denied the return of Christ and the judgment (2 Peter iii. 3 ff.)

[3] Hermae pastor iii. 5, 5: Filius Spiritus sanctus est. iii. 9, 1: Spiritus filius Dei est. iii. 9, 12: Filius Dei omni creatura antiquior est, ita ut in consilio patri suo adfuerit ad condendam creaturam. c. 14: Nomen filii Dei magnum et immensum est, et totus ab eo sustentatur orbis. This spirit dwells in men, i. 5, 1. τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον κατοικοῦν ἐν σοί. iii. 5, 6: Accipiet mercedem omne corpus purum ac sine macula repertum, in quo habitandi gratia constitutus fuerit Spiritus sanctus. The Holy Spirit is the essence of all virtues, which, iii. 9, 13, are designated under the title of virgins, and even called Spiritus sancti: non aliter homo potest in regnum Dei intrare, nisi hae (virgines) induerint eum veste sua. Quicunque nomen filii Dei portat, harum quoque nomina portare debet: nam et Filius nomina portat earum. Respecting the person of Christ, iii. 5, 2: A master entrusts a faithful servant with the care of a vineyard, praecipiens, ut vitibus jungeret palos. The servant does for him still more than he had been ordered. The master consults about rewarding him adhibito filio, quem carum et haeredem habebat, et amicis, quos in consilio advocabat,

trine of *the Docetae* was rejected, which represented Christ's humanity as a mere appearance, in the way that the Jews conceived of the manifestations of angels (Δοκηταί).[4] In the mean time however, speculation relative to the higher nature of Christ and the essence of Christianity, attached itself to the more general questions respecting the creation of the world and the origin of evil. Here the Alexandrine Jewish philosophy presented itself as a pattern. The idea of the λόγος in particular was borrowed from it for the purpose of explaining the higher nature of Christ.[5] John followed this speculation in his gospel, in order to divert it from the region of a fruitless hyper-philosophy into a consideration of *the moral efficacy* of the Logos.[6] It went astray, how-

and concludes: volo eum filio meo facere cohaeredem. The explanation, c. 5: the master is God, Filius autem Spiritus sanctus est: servus vero, ille Filius Dei est. Vinea autem populus est, quem servat ipse. Pali vero Nuncii (angels) sunt, qui a Domino praepositi sunt ad continendum populum ejus. c. 6: Quare autem Dominus in consilio adhibuerit Filium de haereditate et bonos Angelos? Quia Nuncius (Christ) audit illum Spiritum sanctum, qui infusus est omnium primus, in corpore, in quo habitaret Deus. Cum igitur corpus illud paruisset omni tempore Spiritui sancto; placuit Deo—ut et huic corpori—locus aliquis consistendi daretur, ne videretur mercedem servitutis suae perdidisse. A useful application, c. 7: Corpus hoc tuum custodi mundum atque purum; ut Spiritus ille qui inhabitabat in eo, testimonium referat illi, et tecum fuisse judicetur. The eternal Son of God is here the Holy Spirit, and there is no account of a personal union of him with the man Jesus. Against Jachmann Hirte des Hermas, S. 70, und Schliemann Clementinen, S. 423, who wish to defend the orthodoxy of Hermas, see Baur Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit, i. 134.

[4] Later names: Phantasiastae, Phantasiodocetae, Opinarii. Perhaps even 1 Joh. iv. 2; 2 Joh. 7 (see Lücke's Comm. zu Johannes, 2te Aufl. iii. 66). Distinctly and often in Ignatius ad Ephes. vii. 18, ad Trallianos ix. 10, ad Smyrn. 1—8; Ἰησοῦν τὸ δοκεῖν (δοκήσει, φαντασίᾳ) πεπονθέναι, and in the Evang. Petri (Serapion apud Euseb. vi. 12). Cf. Hieronymus adv. Luciferianos (ed. Martian. tom. iv. p. ii. p. 304): Apostolis adhuc in saeculo superstitibus, adhuc apud Judaeam Christi sanguine recenti, phantasma Domini corpus asserebatur. So thought the Jews about the appearances of angels, Tob. xii. 19. Philo de Abrah. p. 366: περάστιον δὲ καὶ τὸ μὴ πεινῶντας πεινώντων, καὶ μὴ ἐσθίοντας ἐσθιόντων παρέχειν φαντασίαν. (Comp. Neander's gnostische Systeme, S. 23.) Josephus antt. i. 11, 2; v. 6, 2, φαντάσματος δ' αὐτῷ (Gideoni) παρασταίντος νεανίσκου μορφῇ. The church fathers had the very same idea of the appearances of angels, comp. Keilii opusc. ed. Goldhorn ii. 548. H. A. Niemeyer comm. de Docetis. Halae, 1823. 4.

[5] So also in the κήρυγμα Πέτρου. Clem. Alex. strom. i. p. 427, Credner's Beiträge zur Einl. in die bibl. Schriften i. 354.

[6] Lücke's Comm. über d. Evangel. d. Johannes. 3te Aufl. i. 202. C.

ever, at the present time, falling into that false *Gnosis* which denies the fundamental principles of Christianity, and which the apostle Paul had already predicted as respects its essence. The first Christian-Gnostic system was that of Cerinthus, in which, however, the Gnosis did not yet attain a consistent development, but was obliged to accommodate itself to many Jewish opinions.[7]

L. W. Grimm de Joanneae christologiae indole Paulinae comparata. Lips., 1833. 8. K. Frommann's der Johanneische Lehrbegriff in his Verhältnisse zur gesammten biblisch-christl. Lehre. Leipzig, 1839. 8. K. R. Köstlin's Lehrbegriff des Evang. u. der Briefe Johannis. Berlin, 1843. 8.

[7] According to him, the God of the Jews (δημιουργός) is separated from the highest God by a series of Aeons, and the highest God was first revealed by the Aeon Christ. The Mosaic law, however, must be observed, a resurrection and thousand years reign be expected. J. E. Ch. Schmidt Cerinth ein judaisirender Christ, in his Bibliothek für Kritik u. Exegese des N. T. i. 181. H. E. G. Paulus historia Cerinthi in his introductionis in N. T. capita selectiora. Jenae, 1799. 8. Neander's Kirchengesch. 2te Aufl. i. ii. 683.

SECOND DIVISION.

FROM HADRIAN TO SEPTIMUS SEVERUS. FROM 117—193.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 37.

STATE OF PAGANISM.

P. E. Müller de hierarchia et studio vitae asceticae in sacris et mysteriis Graecorum Romanorumque latentibus. Hafn. 1803-8. in the second section, (translated in the neuen Biblioth. der schönen Wissenschaften. Bd. 69. S. 207 ff.) Tzschirner's der Fall des Heidenthums. Bd. 1. S. 124—164.

Although the emperors of this time preserved to the Roman empire external security, maintained internal order and justice, and favoured the sciences,[1] yet the old Roman morality and religious sobriety could not be restored among the degenerate people. The propensity to theosophic mysteries, consecrations, and purifications (§14), produced new institutions which ministered to superstition. They were no longer satisfied with the wandering priests of Isis, the Gauls, Chaldeans, and Magicians. In the second century, many secret rites or mysteries were spread abroad over the Roman empire in addition to the former, (those of the *Dea Syra*, of *Isis*, of *Mithras*). Besides these, the old Eleusinian and Dionysian mysteries also, came again into greater repute, though it would appear that they were variously accommodated to the spirit of the time. Abstinence from sensual pleasures was a universal condition of initiation, by which it was supposed that the people obtained a nearer communion with the deities as they passed through the different gradations of the mysteries. This period was distinguished by its godless condition. Mistaking the religious moral way, it sought to obtain purity by

[1] Schlosser's universalhist. Uebersicht d. Geschichte d. alten Welt. iii. ii. 167. Bernhardy's Grundriss d. röm. Literatur. S. 126. The same author's Grundriss d. griech. Literatur. i. 406.

magic, with the aid of all kinds of external observances. We have a proof in the horrible *Taurobolium* and *Kriobolium* which now appeared, of the extreme sensuality of superstition. The prevailing philosophy continued to be that *Platonic eclecticism* which adopted and defended all superstitions,[2] although by it a certain monotheism was elevated above polytheism, even in the view of the people generally.[3] Among the Platonics of this time, the most distinguished are *Plutarch* of *Chaeronea*, [† 120], *Apuleius* of *Madaura*, [about 170], and *Maximus* of *Tyre*, [about 190]. In opposition to this doctrinal philosophy, scepticism too was always rising to a higher degree of strength. *Sextus Empiricus*.

§ 38.

FATE OF THE JEWS.

Dio Cassius lxviii. c. 32, lxix. c. 12—14. Euseb. hist. eccl. iv. c. 2 u. 6.—F. Münter der jüd. Krieg unter den Kaisern Trajan u. Hadrian. Altona u. Leipz. 1821, 8. Jost's Gesch. d. Israeliten, Th. 3, S. 181 ff.

The hatred of the Jews against the Romans was still more increased by the destruction of Jerusalem, and by great oppression that followed, and soon began to manifest itself in new acts of rebellion. An insurrection first broke out in *Cyrenaica* (115),

[2] Numenius (about 130) *περὶ ταγαθοῦ* lib. i. (apud Eusebii praep. evang. ix. 7): *Εἰς δὲ τοῦτο δεήσει εἰπόντα, καὶ σημηνάμενον ταῖς μαρτυρίαις τοῦ Πλάτωνος, ἀναχωρήσασθαι καὶ ξυνδήσασθαι τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ Πυθαγόρου· ἐπικαλέσασθαι δὲ τὰ ἔθνη τὰ εὐδοκιμοῦντα, προσφερόμενον αὐτῶν τὰς τελετάς, καὶ τὰ δόγματα, τάς τε ἰδρύσεις συντελουμένας Πλάτωνι ὁμολογουμένως, ὁπόσας Βραχμᾶνες, καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ Μάγοι, καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι διέθεντο.*

[3] Maximus Tyrius diss. xvii. (al. i.) ex rec. J. Davisii. Lond. 1740. 4. p. 193, with reference to the different opinions of men respecting divine things: *Ἐν τοσούτῳ δὴ πολέμῳ, καὶ στάσει, καὶ διαφωνίᾳ, ἕνα ἴδοις ἂν ἐν πάσῃ γῇ ὁμόφωνον νόμον καὶ λόγον, ὅτι Θεὸς εἷς πάντων βασιλεύς, καὶ πατήρ, καὶ θεοὶ πολλοί, Θεοῦ παῖδες, συνάρχοντες Θεῷ. Ταῦτα δὲ ὁ Ἕλλην λέγει, καὶ ὁ βάρβαρος λέγει, καὶ ὁ ἠπειρώτης, καὶ ὁ θαλάττιος, καὶ ὁ σοφὸς, καὶ ὁ ἄσοφος. κἂν ἐπὶ τοῦ ὠκεανοῦ ἔλθῃς τὰς ἠϊόνας, κἀκεῖ θεοί, τοῖς μὲν ἀνίσχοντες ἀγχοῦ μάλα, τοῖς δὲ καταδύομενοι.* Accordingly we now frequently meet with the view that the numerous names of the deities designated nothing but the same being under different aspects. Apuleji metamorph. lib. xi. ed. Elmenhorst. p. 258 ss. Lobeck Aglaophamus T. i. p. 460 ss. To this also the figurae pantheae frequently found on gems point.

which spread over *Egypt* also, and raged longest in *Cyprus*. Another was kindled simultaneously in *Mesopotamia*. Even Hadrian found relapses of these rebellions, which required to be combated; and appears to have been led by them to entertain the idea of doing away the dangerous nationality of this people, by prohibiting circumcision.[1] And since he resolved at the same time to restore Jerusalem by means of a Roman colony, a pretended Messiah soon made his appearance, who, under the title of *Bar Cochba* (Numb. xxiv. 17),[2] obtained many adherents, especially by the recognition of *R. Akiba*, elevated the fortress *Bether* to be the seat of his kingdom, and endeavoured from it to drive the Romans out of the land (132). His conquests had already extended beyond Syria, when *Julius Severus* appeared, and, after a bloody war, put an end to the insurrection by taking possession of Bether (135). Palestine became a complete wilderness. The colony of *Aelia Capitolina* rose on the ruins of Jerusalem, but access to it was prohibited to the Jews on pain of death. Hadrian's prohibition of circumcision was first abolished by *Antoninus Pius*.[3]

[1] Spartianus in Hadriano, c. 14. Moverunt ea tempestate et Judaei bellum, quod vetabantur mutilare genitalia.

[2] Called after his want of success, בַּר כּוֹזִבָא filius mendacii.

[3] Modestinus JCtus (about 244) in Dig. lib. xlviii. tit. 8. l. 11: Circumcidere Judaeis filios suos tantum rescripto Divi Pii permittitur: in non ejusdem religionis qui hoc fecerit, castrantis poena irrogatur. Ulpianus in Dig. lib. I. Tit. 2. l. 3. § 3: Eis, qui Judaicam superstitionem sequantur, D. Severus et Antoninus honores (namely, decurionum) adipisci permiserunt: sed et necessitates (the onera functiones et munera incumbent on the decuriones) eis imposuerunt, quae superstitionem eorum non laederent. Julius Paulus (about 222) in his sententiis receptis (in Schultingii jurisprudentia vetus antejustinianea and Hugo jus civile antejustin. tom. i.) lib. v. Tit. 22. de seditiosis 3: Cives Romani, qui se Judaico ritu vel servos suos circumcidi patiuntur, bonis ademptis in insulam perpetuo relegantur. Medici capite puniuntur. 4. Judaei si alienae nationis comparatos servos circumciderint, aut deportantur aut capite puniuntur. Even the Samaritans were not allowed to practise circumcision, Origenes c. Celsum ii. c. 13. p. 68. ed Spencer.

FIRST CHAPTER.

EXTERNAL HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 39.

ITS DIFFUSION.

Although the Christian writers of this time manifestly speak in exaggerated terms of the spread of Christianity,[1] yet the extraordinary progress it made cannot be mistaken. In the west, it extended from Rome to western *Africa*, where *Carthage* was its chief seat.[2] In *Gaul*, we find churches at *Lyons* and *Vienne*,

[1] Justin. dial. c. Tryph. c. 117: οὐδὲ ἓν γὰρ ὅλως ἐστὶ τὸ γένος ἀνθρώπων, εἴτε βαρβάρων, εἴτε Ἑλλήνων, εἴτε ἁπλῶς ὡτινιοῦν ὀνόματι προσαγορευομένων, ἢ ἀμαξοβίων, ἢ ἀοίκων καλουμένων, ἢ ἐν σκηναῖς κτηνοτρόφων οἰκούντων, ἐν οἷς μὴ διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ σταυρωθέντος Ἰησοῦ εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίαι τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ποιητῇ τῶν ὅλων γίνονται. Irenaeus i. 3: καὶ οὔτε αἱ ἐν Γερμανίαις ἱδρυμέναι ἐκκλησίαι ἄλλως πεπιστεύκασιν, ἢ ἄλλως παραδιδόασιν, οὔτε ἐν ταῖς Ἰβηρίαις, οὔτε ἐν Κελτοῖς, οὔτε κατὰ τὰς ἀνατολὰς, οὔτε ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, οὔτε ἐν Λιβύῃ, οὔτε αἱ κατὰ μέσα τοῦ κόσμου ἱδρυμέναι. Tertullianus adv. Judaeos c. 7: In quem enim alium universae gentes crediderunt nisi in Christum, qui jam venit? Cui enim et aliae gentes crediderunt: Parthi, Medi, Elamitae, et qui inhabitant Mesopotamiam, Armeniam, Phrygiam, Cappadociam, et incolentes Pontum et Asiam, Pamphyliam, immorantes Aegyptum et regionem Africae, quae est trans Cyrenen, inhabitantes Romam, et incolae tunc et in Hierusalem Judaei et caeterae gentes (according to Act. ii. 9, 10): etiam Getulorum varietates, et Maurorum multi fines, Hispaniarum omnes termini, et Galliarum diversae nationes, et Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero subdita, et Sarmatarum et Dacorum et Germanorum et Scytharum et abditarum multarum gentium, et provinciarum et insularum multarum, nobis ignotarum, et quae enumerare minus possumus. In the Roman empire: Tertulliani apol. c. 37: Si enim hostes exertos, non tantum vindices occultos agere vellemus, deesset nobis vis numerorum et copiarum? Plures nimirum Mauri et Marcomanni ipsique Parthi, vel quantaecunque, unius tamen loci et suorum finium, gentes, quam totius orbis? Hesterni sumus, et vestra omnia implevimus, urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, conciliabula, castra ipsa, tribus, decurias, palatium, senatum, forum. Iren. iv. 49, mentions fideles, qui in regali aula sunt et ex iis, quae Caesaris sunt, habent utensilia.

[2] Fr. Münteri primordia eccl. Africanae. Hafn. 1829. 4. p. 6 ss. The numbers of the Christians here, even so early as the end of the second

immediately after the middle of the second century (Euseb. v. c. 1). From this country Christianity may have spread into *Germany* (cisrhenana)[3] and *Britain*, but only by the efforts of individuals. In the east, we find it firmly established in *Edessa*, so early as the middle of the second century;[4] and from this city it had also extended itself, as it seems, into the countries lying eastward.[5] In northern Arabia,[6] there must likewise have been Christians so early as this period. About 180, *Pantaenus* went from Alexandria to India,[7] to preach the gospel in that region (Euseb. h. e. v. 10).

§ 40.

OPPOSITION TO CHRISTIANITY BY WRITERS.

Tzchirner's der Fall des Heidenthums. Bd. 1, S. 313 ff.

The principal opponent of Christianity at this period was the

century, may be inferred from Tertullian apologet. c. 37: Hesterni sumus et vestra omnia implevimus, urbes, insulas, castella, municipia etc., and adv. Scapul. c. 5, when it is said that, in case of a persecution of the Christians, Carthage would have to be decimated. About 200 A.D. a synod was held under Agrippinus, bishop of Carthage (Cyprian. epist. 71 and 73), which, according to Augustin. de baptism ii. c. 13, consisted of seventy African and Numidian bishops.

[3] C. J. Hefele's Gesch. d. Einführung des Christenthums in südwestl. Deutschland. Tübingen, 1837. S. 42.

[4] The Christian scholar Bardesanes, about 160—170, was highly esteemed by the prince of Edessa Abgar Bar Manu. According to the Chronicon of Edessa in Assemani bibl. orient. i. 391, the church of the Christians in Edessa was destroyed by an inundation as early as 202 A.D. Comp. Bayer historia Osrhoena et Edessena. Petrop. 1734. 4. p. 170.

[5] Bardesanes de fato (in Eusebii praepar. evang. vi. c. 10): *οὔτε οἱ ἐν Παρθίᾳ Χριστιανοὶ πολυγαμοῦσι, Πάρθοι ὑπάρχοντες, οὔθ' οἱ ἐν Μηδίᾳ κυσὶ παραβάλλουσι τοὺς νεκρούς· οὐχ οἱ ἐν Περσίδι γαμοῦσι τὰς θυγατέρας αὐτῶν, Πέρσαι ὄντες· οὐ παρὰ Βάκτροις καὶ Γάλλοις φθείρουσι τοὺς γάμους· οὐχ οἱ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ θρησκεύουσι τὸν Ἄπιν, ἢ τὸν Κύνα, ἢ τὸν Τράγον, ἢ Αἴλουρον· ἀλλ' ὅπου εἰσίν, οὔτε ὑπὸ τῶν κακῶς κειμένων νόμων, καὶ ἐθῶν νικῶνται.*

[6] Arabia petraea, since the time of Trajan a Roman province under the name Arabia, its chief city being Bostra, or Nova Colonia Trajana. So early as the middle of the third century there were many bishops here, Euseb. vi. 33, 37.

Probably Yemen, see § 27, Not. 28. Comp. Redepenning's Origines i. 66.

Epicurean *Celsus* (about 150), who, in a work styled "ἀληθὴς λόγος," and perhaps in others now lost, collected all that could be said against it with any appearance of probability.[1] The cynic philosopher *Crescens*, and the rhetorician *M. Cornelius Fronto* (about 150), are known as the enemies of Christianity only by detached passages.[2] *Lucian* of Samosata (about 180) also considered Christianity in no other light, than as one of the many follies of the time, which deserved the satirical lash.[3]

[1] Celsus and his work are known only by the refutation of Origen (contra Celsum libb. viii. ed. G. Spencer. Cantabrig. 1677, 4to, translated by Mosheim, Hamburg, 1745, 4to, cf. C. R. Jachmann de Celso philosopho disseruit, et fragmenta libri, quem contra Christianos edidit, collegit, a Koenigsberg Easter-programm 1836, 4). Origen calls him an Epicurean (i. p. 8, εὑρίσκεται ἐξ ἄλλων συγγραμμάτων Ἐπικούρειος ὤν), who merely kept back his Epicureanism in his work (iv. p. 163, μὴ πάνυ ἐμφαίνων διὰ τοῦ συγγράμματος τὸν Ἐπικούρειον, ἀλλὰ προσποιούμενος πρόνοιαν εἰδέναι), and assumed the mien of a Platonic philosopher (iv. p. 219, ἐν πολλοῖς πλατωνίζειν θέλει); doubtless because he was able to influence the religious heathen only in this way. In opposition to the opinion that Celsus was really a Platonist, which has become common on Mosheim's authority (preface to his version of Origen, P. 22 ff.), his Epicureanism is asserted by J. F. Fenger de Celso, Christianorum adversario, Epicureo comm. Havn. 1828, 8, Tzschirner's Fall des Heidenthums i. 325. According to F. A. Philippi de Celsi, adversarii Christianorum, philosophandi genere. Berol. 1836, 8. he was an eclectic with a special leaning to Epicurus. According to C. W. I. Bindemann (über Celsus u. seine Schrift gegen die Christen, in Illgen's Zeitschr. für d. hist. Theol. 1842, ii. 58), he was a Platonic philosopher of a more liberal tendency, who agreed with Epicurus in many points. According to Origen, i. p. 28, Celsus lived κατὰ Ἀδριανὸν καὶ κατωτέρω: It is certain that he wrote in the second half of the second century, for he recognises the whole of the Gnostic sects, and even the Marcionites (v. p. 272), as parties completely formed. Probably he is the same Celsus to whom Lucian dedicates his Alexander, as is assumed by the ancient scholiast (see Luciani Alexander ed. C. G. Jacob, Colon. 1828, p. 8. Fenger p. 40 ss. Bindemann l. c. 99). Origen does not know (i. p. 53, iv. p. 186) whether he is the same Celsus who wrote several books against magic, and two other books against the Christians.

[2] Respecting Crescens comp. Euseb. iv. 16, where also the passages Justin. apol. ii. c. 3. Tatian. orat. c. 19, are quoted. Respecting Fronto see Minucius Fel. c. 9 and c. 31.

[3] In his works de morte Peregrini c. 11—16. Alexander c. 25, 38, de vera historia i. 12, 30, ii. 4, 11, 12, cf. Walchii rerum christianarum apud Lucianum de morte Peregr. explicatio, in the Novis commentariis Soc. Reg. scient. Gotting. t. viii. p. 1 ss. Lucianus num scriptis suis adjuvare religionem christianam voluerit diss. scripsit H. C. A. Eichstädt. Jenae 1820, 4. (also in Luciani opp. ed. Lehmann t. i. p. lxxv. ss.). Tzschirner's Gesch. d. Apologetik. i. 200 ff. The same author's Fall des

§ 41.

DISPOSITION OF THE PEOPLE IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE TOWARDS CHRISTIANITY.

Christ. Kortholt paganus obtrectator. Kilon. 1698, 4. J. J. Huldrici gentilis obtrectator. Tigur. 1744, 8. G. F. Gudii paganus Christianorum laudator et fautor. Lips. 1741, 4. Tzschirner der Fall des Heidenthums, i. 225 ff. 335 ff. G. G. S. Koepke de statu et conditione Christianorum sub impp. Romanis alterius p. Chr. saeculi. Berol. 1828, 4. (A school-programm.)

In proportion as the peculiar nature of Christianity, as a different system from Judaism, became better known, so much the more must it have appeared, when viewed from the position of a heathen citizen, as a hostile, threatening power, whose rapid diffusion was highly suspicious.[1] The Christians saw only evil demons in the gods of the heathen; and since the worship of the gods had pervaded all forms of life, they were compelled entirely to withdraw themselves from the public and the domestic life of the heathen, from their amusements, and their displays of art.[1] Hence Christianity appeared to the heathen in the light of a misanthropic superstition.[2] But the Christians refused even to

Heidenthums, i. 315 ff. K. G. Jacob's Charakteristik Lucian's v. Samosata. Hamburg 1832, S. 155. Baur's Apollonius von Tyana u. Christus, S. 140. The dialogue Philopatris according to J. M. Gesneri de aetate et auctore dialogi Lucianei, qui Philopatris inscribitur, ed. 3. Gotting. 1741 (also in Luciani opp. ed. Reitz. iii. 708 ss.), is usually placed in the time of Julian. According to Niebuhr it was first composed under the emperor Nicephorus Phocas, in the year 968 or 969, see Corporis scriptt. hist. Byzant. Bonnensis P. xi. (Leo Diaconus, &c.) praef. p. ix. On the other side, see Bernhardy in the Berlin. Jahrbücher Juli 1832, S. 131, and Neander KG. ii. i. 190. A new opinion is advanced by Ehemann in Stirm's Studien der ev. Geistlichk. Wirtemberg's, 1839, S. 47.

[1] Hence from the games (cf. Tertulliani de spectaculis liber), festivities, and banquets, (even the wearing of garlands was not permitted. Tertull. de corona militis. Clemens. Alex. in paedagogo ii. c. 8), from certain professions, &c., cf. Tertull. de idololatria liber. Neander's Antignosticus. Berlin 1825, S. 22 ff. The same author's Kirchengesch. i. i. 450 ff. Fr. Münter's die Christinn im heidnischen Hause vor den Zeiten Constantin's d. G. Kopenh. 1828, 8.

[2] Minucii Felicis Octavius c. 12, the heathen Caecilius says: vos vero suspensi interim atque solliciti honestis voluptatibus abstinetis: non spectacula visitis, non pompis interestis: convivia publica absque vobis;

the emperors the usual marks of divine honour paid them.[3] They cherished among them the expectation that a near destruction was impending over all the kingdoms of the earth;[4] and many would not undertake civil and military offices to which they were called.[5] It was natural, therefore, that they should be looked upon as bad citizens; and however solemn was their asseveration that Christianity demanded still greater obedience to the powers under which they lived,[6] it appeared, notwithstanding, in the eyes of the heathen, accustomed as they were to a religion subordinate to political objects, a circumstance so much the more suspicious, that the Christians were constantly obliged to annex a condition, viz. that the commands of the magistrate should not contradict the Divine law.[7] The moral impression which the doctrine and

sacra certamina, praecerptos cibos et delibatos altaribus potus abhorretis. Sic reformidatis deos, quos negatis. Non floribus caput nectitis, non corpus odoribus honestatis: reservatis unguenta funeribus, coronas etiam sepulcris denegatis, pallidi, trepidi, misericordia digni et nostrorum deorum, c. 8: latebrosa et lucifuga natio, in publicum muta, in angulis garrula.

[3] Theophil. ad Autolycum i. 11: ἐρεῖς μοι · διὰ τί οὐ προσκυνεῖς τὸν βασιλέα; Tertullianus ad nationes i. 17: Prima obstinatio est, quae secunda ab eis religio constituitur Caesarianae majestatis, quod irreligiosi dicamur in Caesares: neque imagines eorum repropitiando, neque genios dejerando hostes populi nuncupamur. Tertull. de idololatr. c. 13—15, is zealous even against the illumination and decoration of the doors in honour, of the emperors, cf. c. 15: Igitur quod attineat ad honores regum vel imperatorum, satis praescriptum habemus, in omni obsequio esse nos oportere, secundum Apostoli praeceptum, subditos magistratibus et principibus et potestatibus: sed intra limites disciplinae, quousque ab idololatria separamur.—Accendant igitur quotidie lucernas, quibus lux nulla est, adfigant postibus lauros postmodum arsuras, quibus ignes imminent: illis competunt et testimonia tenebrarum, et auspicia poenarum. Tu lumen es mundi, et arbor virens semper. Si templis renuntiasti, ne feceris templum januam tuam.

[4] How this was expressed in a manner exasperating to the heathen, especially by the Montanists, see below § 48, note 5. On this account, it appeared to the heathen politically dangerous. Justini apol. i. 11: καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀκούσαντες βασιλείαν προσδοκῶντας ἡμᾶς, ἀκρίτως ἀνθρώπινον λέγειν ἡμᾶς ὑπειλήφατε, ἡμῶν τὴν μετὰ θεοῦ λεγόντων.

[5] Especially Tertull. de idol. c. 17, 18. Idem de cor. militis. c. 11. Origen. c. Celsum. viii. p. 427: Still, however, there were many Christian soldiers at this time. Neander's KG. i. i. 464.

[6] Epist. eccl. Smyrn. ap. Euseb. iv. 15, 9. Justinus M. apol. i. 17. Irenaeus v. 24. Theophil. ad Autolycum i. 11.

[7] Tertulliani apologet. c. 2: Christianum hominem omnium scelerum rerum, deorum, imperatorum, legum, morum, naturae totius inimicum exis-

customs of the Christians must have made on the unbiassed, was weakened by prejudices. The Jews, in whom an accurate knowledge of Christianity was presupposed, contributed to increase the disposition which was adverse to it.[8] Many of the heathen recognised in the Christian doctrine much that was true, but believed that they possessed it still purer in their philosophy,[9] and took offence at its positive doctrines.[10] Credulous persons allowed themselves to be deceived by ridiculous fabrications respecting the objects which the Christians worshipped;[11] the superstitious

timas. c. 35: publici hostes Christiani.—nos nolunt Romanos haberi, sed hostes principum Romanorum. ad Scapulam c. 2: Circa majestatem imperatoris infamamur.—Christianus nullius est hostis, nedum imperatoris: quem sciens a Deo suo constitui, necesse est ut et ipsum diligat, et revereatur, et honoret, et salvum velit cum toto Romano imperio, quousque saeculum stabit. Tamdiu enim stabit. Colimus ergo et imperatorem sic, quomodo et nobis licet, et ipsi expedit, ut hominem a Deo secundum, et quicquid est, a Deo consecutum, solo Deo minorem. cf. contra Gnosticos c. 14.

[8] Justinus M. dial. c. Tryph. c. 17 and 108, speaks of Jewish emissaries, who had gone out from Jerusalem into all the world, in order to calumniate Christ and the Christians. Accordingly, the Jews were particularly active about the execution of Polycarp, Epist. eccl. Smyrn. ap. Euseb. iv. 15, 11: μάλιστα Ἰουδαίων προθύμως, ὡς ἔθος αὐτοῖς, εἰς τοῦτο ὑπουργούντων. Respecting the cursings of the Christians in the synagogues, see Justinus dial. c. Tryph. c. xvi. 47, 96, 108, 117, 137. Hieronymus in Es. v. 18; xlix. 7, lii. 5, in Amos. i. 11. Semisch Justin d. Märtyrer i. 28.

[9] Celsus, in particular, often reverts to this (Orig. c. Cels. v. p. 274), βουλόμενος τὰ καλὰ—καὶ βέλτιον καὶ τρανότερον εἰρῆσθαι παρὰ τοῖς φιλοσοφοῦσιν (vi. p. 275): καὶ χωρὶς ἀνατάσεως καὶ ἐπαγγελίας τῆς ἀπὸ θεοῦ, ἢ υἱοῦ θεοῦ. So he remarks (vii. p. 370) regarding the Christian prohibition of revenge, Matth. v. 39: ἀρχαῖον καὶ τοῦτο εὖ μάλα πρόσθεν εἰρημένον, ἀγροικότερον δ' αὐτὸ ἀπεμνημόνευται· ἐπεὶ καὶ Πλάτωνι πεποίηται Σωκράτης Κρίτωνι διαλεγόμενος τάδε κ. τ. λ. He assumes, in plain terms, that the Christians had borrowed these doctrines from the Greek philosophers, particularly from Plato (vi. p. 283—288). Tertull. apolog. c. 46.

[10] The heathen said, apud Arnobius i. c. 36: Sed non iccirco dii vobis infesti sunt, quod omnipotentem colatis Deum: sed quod hominem natum, et, quod personis infame est vilibus, crucis supplicio interemptum, et Deum fuisse contenditis, et superesse adhuc creditis, et quotidianis supplicationibus adoratis. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body, and the judgment, was particularly offensive, comp. Celsus (Teller fides dogmatis de resurrect. carnis per. iv. priora secula. Halae 1766, 8, p. 270). Tertull. apologet. c. 18: Haec et nos risimus aliquando. De vestris fuimus: fiunt, non nascuntur Christiani.

[11] Tertulliani apologet. c. 16: somniastis, caput asininum esse Deum nostrum,—crucis nos religiosos.—Alii plane humanius et verisimilius solem credunt deum nostrum.—Sed nova jam Dei nostri in ista civitate

inferred from their oppressed condition, the impotence of their God;[12] and, finally, the foreign origin of Christianity,[13] as well as the humble lot of most of its votaries,[14] were as offensive to all, as the idea of a universal religion was absurd.[15] The external morality of the Christians could not fail to be perceived by the heathen;[16] and the brotherly love prevailing among them had

proximo editio publicata est, namely, pictura cum ejusmodi inscriptione: Deus Christianorum Ononychites (according to E. A. Schulzii exercitt. philolog. fasc. i. p. 30: Ononychotus; according to Havercamp. and Münter primord. eccl. Afr. p. 167: Onokoitis). Is erat auribus asininis, altero pede ungulatus, librum gestans, et togatus, (see Münter's Christinn im heidn. Hause S. 18). Minucius Felix c. 9, below not. 19. Comp. above § 16, not. 6.—Other fictions respecting the person of Jesus are referred to by Celsus, Orig. c. Cels. i. p. 22 ss.

[12] The heathen Caecilius says, apud Minuc. Felix. c. 12: Ecce pars vestrum et major et melior, ut dicitus, egetis, algetis, ope, re, fame laboratis: et Deus patitur, dissimulat, non vult aut non potest opitulari suis, ita aut invalidus, aut iniquus est.—Nonni Romani sine vestro Deo imperant, regnant. fruuntur orbe toto, vestrique dominantur?

[13] Celsus therefore calls it *βάρβαρον δόγμα*, Orig. c. Cels. i. p. 5.

[14] Caecilius apud Minuc. Felix c. 5: Indignandum omnibus, indolescendumque est, audere quosdam. et hoc studiorum rudes, literarum profanos, expertes artium etiam nisi sordidarum, certum aliquid de summa rerum ac majestate decernere. de qua tot omnibus saeculis sectarum plurimarum usque adhuc ipsa philosophia deliberat. Cap. 12: Proinde si quid sapientiae vobis aut verecundiae est, desinite coeli plagas, et mundi fata et secreta rimari: satis est pro pedibus adspicere, maxime indoctis, impolitis, rudibus, agrestibus: quibus non est datum intelligere civilia, multo magis denegatum est disserere divina. How the Christians drew over to themselves ignorant, humble, and immoral men, is described by Celsus with hostile exaggeration, apud Origines adv. Cels. iii. p. 144 ss.

[15] Celsus (Orig. c. Cels. viii. p. 425): *Εἰ γὰρ δὴ οἵόντε εἰς ἕνα συμφρονῆσαι νόμον τοὺς τὴν Ἀσίαν, καὶ Εὐρώπην, καὶ Λιβύην, Ἕλληνάς τε καὶ βαρβάρους, ἄχρι περάτων νενεμημένους!—ὁ τοῦτο οἰόμενος οἶδεν οὐδέν.*

[16] The famous physician Claudius Galen (about 160) said in one of his last works (the passage is cited in a Syriac translation in Bar-Hebraei chron. syr. ed. Bruns et Kirsch p. 55, from Gal. comm. in Phaedonem Platonis; more copiously in Arabic in Abulfedae historia anteislamica ed Fleischer p. 109, from Gal. de sententiis politiae Platonicae): Hominum plerique orationem demonstrativam continuam mente assequi nequeunt, quare indigent, ut instituantur parabolis. Veluti nostro tempore videmus, homines illos, qui Christiani vocantur, fidem suam e parabolis petiise. Hi tamen interdum talia faciunt, qualia qui vere philosophantur. Nam quod mortem contemnunt, id quidem omnes ante oculos habemus; item quod verecundia quadam ducti ab usu rerum venerearum abhorrent. Sunt enim inter eos et foeminae et viri, qui per totam vitam a concubitu abstinue-

unquestionably attracted many a feeling heart to Christianity, although it sometimes also allured low selfishness;[17] but the secret meetings of both sexes[18] gave occasion to hatred, and furnished a ground for misinterpreting that love, by changing it into one of an impure character, and several Christian practices into crimes,[19]

rint; sunt etiam, qui in animis regendis coërcendisque et in acerrimo honestatis studio eo progressi sint, ut nihil cedant vere philosophantibus.

[17] Lucianus de morte Peregrini, c. 11—16.

[18] Particularly nightly meetings, which were strictly forbidden by the law, (see § 12, note 6), and constantly awakened suspicion.

[19] Tertull. apologet. c. 39: Sed ejusmodi vel maxime dilectionis operatio notam nobis inurit penes quosdam. Vide, inquiunt, ut invicem se diligant; ipsi enim invicem oderunt: et ut pro alterutro mori sint parati; ipsi enim ad occidendum alterutrum paratiores. Sed et quod fratrum appellatione censemur,—infamant. The heathen Octavius ap. Minucius Felix, c. 9: Occultis se notis et insignibus (according to c. 31, § 9, notaculo corporis: the Carpocratians actually marked themselves on the ear, Iren. i. 24. Epiphan. haer. xxvii. 5) noscunt, et amant mutuo paene ante quam noverint: passim etiam inter eos velut quaedam libidinum religio miscetur: ac se promiscue appellant fratres et sorores, ut etiam non insolens stuprum, intercessione sacri nominis, fiat incestum. Ita eorum vana et demens superstitio sceleribus gloriatur. Nec de ipsis, nisi subsisteret veritas, maxime nefaria et honore praefanda sagax fama loqueretur. Audio, eos turpissimae pecudis, caput asini consecratum inepta nescio qua persuasione venerari: digna et nata religio talibus moribus. Alii eos ferunt ipsius antistitis ac sacerdotis colere genitalia, et quasi parentis sui adorare naturam: nescio an falsa, certe occultis ac nocturnis sacris apposita suspicio: et qui hominem, summo supplicio pro facinore punitum, et crucis ligna feralia, eorum caerimonias fabulatur congruentia perditis sceleratisque tribuit altaria, ut id colant, quod merentur. Jam de initiandis tirunculis fabula tam detestanda, quam nota est. Infans farre contectus, ut decipiat incautos, apponitur ei, qui sacris imbuitur. Is infans a tirunculo, farris superficie quasi ad innoxios ictus provocata, caecis occultisque vulneribus occiditur: hujus (proh nefas!) sitienter sanguinem lambunt: hujus certatim membra discerpunt: hac foederantur hostia.—Et de convivio notum est, (passim omnes loquuntur), id etiam Cirtensis nostri testatur oratio: ad epulas solemni die coëunt, cum omnibus liberis, sororibus, matribus, sexus omnis homines et omnis aetatis. Illic post multas epulas, ubi convivium caluit, et incestae libidinis fervor ebrietate exarsit, canis, qui candelabro nexus est, jactu offulae ultra spatium lineae, qua vinctus est, ad impetum et saltum provocatur: sic everso et exstincto conscio lumine impudentibus tenebris nexus infandae cupiditatis involvunt per incertum sortis, &c. (Cf. Tertull. apolog. c. 8, ad nationes i. 16: Also Apulejus metam. ix. p. 223, ed. Elmenhorst. alludes to the same subject. Clemens Alex. strom. iii. c. 2, relates the same thing of the Carpocratians, from whom it was falsely transferred to all Christians, cf. Euseb. h. e. iv. 7, 5). According to Athenagoras Apol. c. 4, the heathen brought three charges in particular against the Christians: ἀθεότητα, θυέστεια δεῖπνα and Οἰδιποδείους μίξεις.

just as they had appeared in their own mysteries, and other secret societies.[20] The steadfastness of the martyrs must, indeed, have invited every unbiassed mind to a nearer acquaintance with the source of this lofty spirit;[21] but yet an unfavourable opinion was entertained regarding that too, even by the cultivated, agreeably to preconceived notions.[22] The Jews were still protected by their peculiar national character.[23] But the Christians were looked upon merely as ignorant and wild fanatics, who wished to destroy all established order. The cultivated laughed, contemptuously at them on account of the confidence and obstinacy of their religious faith;[24] the *goetae* (impostors)

[20] So among the Bacchanals in Rome, A.D. 185. Comp. the expressions of Livy xxxix. 13: Ex quo in promiscuo sacra sint, et permixti viri feminis, et noctis licentia accesserit, nihil ibi facinoris, nihil flagitii praetermissum, plura virorum inter sese, quam feminarum esse stupra. Si qui minus patientes dedecoris sint, et pigriores ad facinus, pro victimis immolari, &c. Catiline employed human blood as pignus conjurationis (Sallust. Catil. 22), quo inter se fidi magis forent, alius alii tanti facinoris conscii. Dio Cassius xxxvii. 30, relates of the same person: *παῖδά τινα καταθύσας, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν σπλάγχνων αὐτοῦ τὰ ὅρκια ποιήσας, ἔπειτα ἐσπλάγχνευσεν αὐτὰ μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων.*

[21] Justinus M. apol. ii. c. 12, speaks of the impression which they had made upon him. Tertull. apologeticus, c. 50: nec quicquam tamen proficit exquisitior quaeque crudelitas vestra, illecebra est magis sectae; plures efficimur, quoties metimur a vobis; semen est sanguis Christianorum.—Illa ipsa obstinatio, quam exprobratis, magistra est. Quis enim non contemplatione ejus concutitur ad requirendum, quid intus in re sit? Quis non, ubi requisivit, accedit? ubi accessit, pati exhortat?

[22] Tertull. apolog. c. 27: Quidam dementiam existimant, quod cum possimus et sacrificare in praesenti, et illaesi abire, manente apud animum proposito, obstinationem saluti praeferamus, c. 50: propterea desperati et perditi existimamur. Arrianus comm. de Epicteti disputationibus iv. c. 7: *εἶτα ὑπό μανίας μὲν δύναταί τις οὕτω διατεθῆναι πρὸς ταῦτα (θάνατον κ. τ. λ.) καὶ ὑπὸ ἔθους ὡς οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι, ὑπὸ λόγου δὲ καὶ ἀποδείξεως οὐδεὶς δύναται;* Schweighäuser in his edition, Th. 2, S. 915, looks upon the words *ὡς οἱ* Γαλ. as a gloss. Marc. Aurel. *εἰς ἑαυτόν*, xi. c. 3: *Οἷα ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχὴ ἡ ἕτοιμος, ἐὰν ἤδη ἀπολυθῆναι δέῃ τοῦ σώματος, καὶ ἤτοι σβεσθῆναι σκεδασθῆναι, ἢ συμμεῖναι; τὸ δὲ ἕτοιμον τοῦτο, ἵνα ἀπὸ ἰδικῆς κρίσεως ἔρχηται, μὴ κατὰ ψιλὴν παράταξιν, ὡς οἱ Χριστιανοί, ἀλλὰ λελογισμένως, καὶ σεμνῶς, καὶ ὥστε καὶ ἄλλον πεῖσαι, ἀταγώδως.* Eichstädt (Exercit. Antoniniana iii.) conjectures that the words *ὡς οἱ* Χ*ρ* were a later interpolation in this place.

[23] Celsus ap. Origen. contra Celsum lib. v. p. 247, 259: *εἰ μὲν δὴ κατὰ ταῦτα περιστέλλοιεν Ἰουδαῖοι τὸν ἴδιον νόμον, οὐ μεμπτὰ αὐτῶν, ἐκείνων δὲ μᾶλλον, τῶν καταλιπόντων τὰ σφέτερα, καὶ τὰ Ἰουδαίων προσποιουμένων.*

[24] How the Jews and Christians had become a proverb on this account, see Galenus de pulsuum differentiis lib. ii. (ed. Kühn viii. 579):

were inimical to them as opponents of their interest;[25] the people hated them as despisers of their gods (ἄθεοι, ἀσεβεῖς), and in the public misfortunes saw nothing but admonitions from heaven to exterminate them.[26]

§ 42.

PERSECUTIONS OF CHRISTIANITY.

The laws against *religiones peregrinae* and *collegia illicita* still remained in force even in reference to the Christians;[1] but they were by no means universally and uniformly enforced. The persecutions of this period were rather the effects of the people's hatred, to which the magistrates gave way, and also of personal malevolence in those possessing official power. Hence all the persecutions of the period were confined merely to single cities or provinces. Under *Hadrian* (117—138) the people first began to clamour for the execution of some Christians at the public festivals. But at the representation of Serenius Granianus, proconsul of Asia Minor, Hadrian issued a rescript to the successor of the proconsul, interdicting such tumultuous proceedings.[2] The

Κάλλιον δ' ἂν ἦν πολλῷ προσθεῖναι τινα—ἀπόδειξιν,—ἵνα μή τις εὐθὺς κατ' ἀρχὰς, ὡς εἰς Μωϋσοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ διατριβὴν ἀφιγμένος, νόμων ἀναποδείκτων ἀκούῃ. lib. iii. (p. 657): Θᾶττον γὰρ ἄν τις τοὺς ἀπὸ Μωϋσοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ μεταδιδάξειεν, ἢ τοὺς ταῖς αἱρέσεσι προστετηκότας ἰατροὺς τε καὶ φιλοσόφους.

[25] Thus spoke the false prophet Alexander of Abonoteichos (Luciani Alex. c. 25) to the inhabitants of Pontus, ἀθέων ἐμπεπλῆσθαι καὶ Χριστιανῶν τὸν Πόντον,—οὓς ἐκέλευε λίθοις ἐλαύνειν, εἴγε ἐθέλουσιν ἵλεω ἔχειν τὸν θεόν. And he began his consecrations with the formula (c. 37): εἴ τις ἄθεος ἢ Χριστιανὸς ἢ Ἐπικούρειος ἥκει κατάσκοπος τῶν ὀργίων, φευγέτω.

[26] Tertull. apologet. c. 37, to the Romani imperii antitistes: Quoties in Christianos desaevitis, partim animis propriis, partim legibus obsequentes? Quotiens etiam praeteritis vobis suo jure nos inimicum vulgus invadit lapidibus et incendiis? Ipsis Bacchanalium furiis nec mortuis parcunt Christianis, quin illos de requie sepulturae, de asylo quodam mortis, jam alios, jam nec totos, avellant, dissecent, distrahant. c. 40: Existimant omnis publicae cladis, omnis popularis incommodi Christianos esse causam. Si Tiberis ascendit in moenia, si Nilus non ascendit in arva, si coelum stetit, si terra movit, si fames, si lues, statim: Christianos ad leonem.

[1] Hence Caecilius apud Minuc. Fel. c. 8, calls them homines deploratae, inlicitae ac desperatae factionis. Tertulliani apologetic, c. 38: Inter licitas factiones sectam istam deputari oportebat, a qua nihil tale committitur, quale de illicitis factionibus timeri solet etc.

[2] Originally preserved in Latin by Justin Martyr. apol. i. c. 69: then

tradition regarding this emperor, that he caused temples to be dedicated to Christ, is the more improbable, because he entertained very erroneous and unfavourable notions of the Christians.[3] Under *Antoninus Pius*, the Christians were disturbed afresh once and again (138—161).[4] But the reign of *Marcus*

translated into Greek by Eusebius (h. e. iv. 9). Rufinus (hist. eccl. iv. 9) has probably preserved the Latin original (cf. Alexii Symmachi Mazochii disquisitio in Gallandii biblioth. vett. Patr. T. i. p. 728): Exemplum epistolae imperatoris Adriani ad Minucium Fundanum Proconsulem Asiae: Accepi literas ad me scriptas a decessore tuo Serenio Graniano clarissimo viro: et non placet mihi relationem silentio praeterire, ne et innoxii perturbentur, et calumniatoribus latrocinandi tribuatur occasio. Itaque si evidenter provinciales huic petitioni suae adesse valent adversum Christianos, ut pro tribunali eos in aliquo arguant, hoc eis exsequi non prohibeo: precibus autem in hoc solis et acclamationibus uti, eis non permitto. Etenim multo aequius est, si quis volet accusare, te cognoscere de objectis. Si quis igitur accusat, et probat adversum leges quidquam agere memoratos homines, pro merito peccatorum etiam supplicia statues. Illud mehercle magnopere curabis, ut, si quis calumniae gratia quemquam horum postulaverit reum, in hunc pro sui nequitia suppliciis severioribus vindices. Cf. F. Balduinus ad edicta vett. Princip. Rom. de Christianis, p. 72.

[3] Lampridius in vita Sev. Alexandri, c. 43. Christo templum facere voluit, eumque inter deos recipere. Quod et Adrianus cogitasse fertur, qui templa in omnibus civitatibus sine simulacris jusserat fieri, quae ille ad hoc parasse dicebatur. On the other hand, Spartianus in vita Hadriani, c. 22: Sacra Romana diligentissime curavit, peregrina contempsit. Flav. Vopiscus in vita Saturnini, c. 8, from a work of Phlegon, a freedman of Hadrian: Hadrianus Augustus Serviano Cs. S. Aegyptum, quam mihi laudabas, Serviane carissime, totam didici levem, pendulam et ad omnia famae momenta volitantem. Illi, qui Serapin colunt, Christiani sunt, et devoti sunt Serapi, qui se Christi episcopos dicunt. Nemo illic archisynagogus Judaeorum, nemo Samarites, nemo Christianorum presbyter, non mathematicus, non haruspex, non aliptes. Ipse ille patriarcha cum Aegyptum venerit, ab aliis Serapidem adorare, ab aliis cogitur Christum. Unus illis Deus nullus est. Hunc Christiani, hunc Judaei, hunc omnes venerantur et gentes etc.

[4] Dionysius Corinth. ap. Euseb. iv. p. 23, concerning a persecution in Athens, in which Bishop Publius, the predecessor of Quadratus, suffered. Melito in apolog. ad Marc. Aurel. ap. Euseb. iv., c. 26, § 5: ὁ δὲ πατήρ σου—ταῖς πόλεσι περὶ τοῦ μηδὲν νεωτερίζειν περὶ ἡμῶν ἔγραψεν· ἐν οἷς καὶ πρὸς Λαρισσαίους, καὶ πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς καὶ Ἀθηναίους, καὶ πρὸς πάντας Ἕλληνας. This writing may have given rise to the opinion that the Edictum ad commune Asiae proceeded from Antoninus, although it is manifestly spurious. This edict has been appended by a later hand to Justini apol. i. c. 70, and has been communicated in a different text by Eusebius iv. c. 13, with a reference to Melito (probably to the above passage, which he misunderstood). All that can be said with plausibility in defence of that edict may be seen in T. G.

Aurelius (161—180) was still more unfavourable to them, for in it the frequent misfortunes that befell the empire caused many outbursts of the popular fury against them; while the emperor himself endeavoured right earnestly to maintain the ancient reputation of the state religion.[5] Hence the Christians in Asia Minor[6] suffered persecutions, to which even *Polycarp* (167)[7] fell a sacrifice, while *Justin* (166) became a martyr at Rome.[8] But

Hegelmaier comm. in edictum Imp. Ant. P. pro Christianis. Tubing., 1767. 4. The spuriousness of it, before asserted by J. J. Scaliger, Moyle, Thirlby, has been convincingly proved by Is. Haffner de edicto Antonini Pii pro Christianis ad commune Asiae. Argentor, 1781. 4. Cf. Eichstädt exercitatio Antoniniana v. in the Annales acad. Jen. i. 286. The edict contains an explanation of the edict issued by Hadrian, which had arisen among the Christians. They believed that the expression adversus leges quidquam agere should not be referred to the exercises of Christian worship, and accordingly this edict was explained as an ἐπὶ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν Ῥωμαίων ἐγχειρεῖν. From this, therefore, it followed that whoever accused a Christian as such, without being able to prove against him such a crime, was liable to punishment as a false accuser.

[5] Modestinus (Dig. lib. xlviii. Tit. 19, l. 30): Si quis aliquid fecerit, quo leves hominum animi superstitione numinis terrerentur, Divus Marcus hujusmodi homines in insulam relegari rescripsit. Julii Pauli sententt. receptt. lib. v. Tit. 21, § 2: Qui novas, et usu vel ratione incognitas religiones inducunt, ex quibus animi hominum moveantur, honestiores deportantur, humiliores capite puniuntur. On the religious views of Marcus Aurelius and his sentiments towards the Christians, see Neander's KG. i. i. 177.

[6] Melito in apolog. ad Marc. Aurel. ap. Euseb. iv. 26: τὸ γὰρ οὐδὲ πώποτε γενόμενον, νῦν διώκεται τὸ τῶν θεοσεβῶν γένος, καινοῖς ἐλαυνόμενον δόγμασι κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν· οἱ γὰρ ἀναιδεῖς συκοφάνται καὶ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ἐρασταί, τὴν ἐκ τῶν διαταγμάτων ἔχοτες ἀφορμὴν, φανερῶς ληστεύουσι, νύκτωρ καὶ μεθημέραν διαρπάζοντες τοὺς μηδὲν ἀδικοῦντας.—εἰ δὲ καὶ παρὰ σοῦ μὴ εἴη ἡ βουλὴ αὕτη καὶ τὸ καινὸν τοῦτο διάταγμα,—δεόμεθά σου, μὴ περιϊδεῖν ἡμᾶς ἐν τοιαύτῃ δημώδει λεηλασίᾳ. Neander, KG. i. i. 184, is of opinion that this διάταγμα was certainly issued by the emperor, and is preserved in the Acta Symphoniani apud Ruinart, p. 69. But the very inscription, Aurelius Imp. omnibus administratoribus suis atque rectoribus, throws suspicion on the law there given. The emperor could not open his proclamation with the name Aurelius. See Semisch. in the Theol. Studien u. Kritiken, 1835, iv. 934; administratores is not an official designation of the governors, and the emperor could not call them administratores suos. The emperor could have issued no edict against Christians before 177. See Semisch l. c. S. 935 ff.

[7] Ecclesiae Smyrnensis de martyrio Polycarpi epistola encyclios ap. Euseb. iv. c. 15, first published by Ussher 1647, in a form somewhat longer, then printed in Cotelerii patr. apost. and in Ruinart. On the relation of the two recensions, see Danz de Eusebio, p. 130 ss.

[8] Acta martyrii Justini Philos. apud Ruinart, nova interpretatione,

the recently formed churches at Lyons and Vienne (177)[9] suffered most. The supposed miracle of the *legio Melitina* (κεραυνοβόλος, *fulminatrix*) (174) could have had the less influence on the emperor in favour of the Christians, since so many parties ascribed the merit of it to themselves.[10] Under the barbarous *Commodus* (180—192), the Christians lived in peace.[11]

annotationibus atque disquisitionibus illustrata ab A. S. Mazochio in Gallandii bibl. vett. patr. T. i. p. 707 ss. Semisch on the year of Justin Martyr's death in the theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1835, iv. 907.

[9] Ecclesiarum Viennensis et Lugdunensis epistola ad ecclesias Asiae Phyrygiaeque de passione martyrum suorum ap. Euseb. h. e. v. 1—3. To what a height the rage of the heathen proceeded, is proved, c. i. § 6, by the violation of the ancient law, de servo in dominum quaeri non licere Cic. pro Dejot. c. 1. Tacit. annal. ii. 30. Digest. lib. xlviii. Tit. 18, de quaestionibus.

[10] The heathen writers ascribe the phenomenon partly to the conjurations of the Aegyptian Arnuphis (Dio Cassius in excerpt. Xiphilini lxxi. 8. Suidas s. v. Ἰουλιανός), partly to the prayer of Marcus (Capitolinus in vita Marc. Aurel., c. 24. Themistius in orat. xv. p. 191, ed. Harduini). The emperor himself expresses his opinion on a coin on which Jupiter is represented hurling his lightning against the barbarians lying on the ground (Eckhel numism. iii. 61). Cf. Claudianus de sexto consulatu Honorii v. 342. Similar occurrences are related of Alexander, Curt. iv. 7, 13; of Marius, Orosii hist. v. 15; and Hosidius, Dio Cass. lx., § 9. The Christians, in like manner, ascribed the merit to their deity, cf. Claudius Apollinaris ap. Euseb. v. 5. Tertulliani ad Scapul. c. 4, and especially Apologet. c. 5. At nos e contrario edimus protectorem, si litterae M. Aurelii—requirantur, quibus illam Germanicam sitim, Christianorum forte militum praecationibus impetrato imbri, discussam contestatur. Qui sicut non palam ab ejusmodi hominibus poenam dimovit, ita alio modo palam dispersit, adjecta etiam accusatoribus damnatione, et quidem tetriore. This writing, falsely ascribed to M. Aurelius, was afterwards annexed to Justin Martyr's apolog. i. In it all accusation of the Christians is forbidden under punishment of death by fire. The same thing is found in Edictum ad commune Asiae, note 4.

[11] Marcia, concubine of Commodus, was favourable to the Christians (Dio Cassius lxxii. 4). On the martyrdom of Apollonius, see Euseb. h. e. v. 21; Hieron. catal. c. 42. According to Jerome, he was betrayed by a slave Severus; according to Eusebius, his accuser was immediately put to death, ὅτι μὴ ζῆν ἐξὸν ἦν κατὰ βασιλικὸν ὅρον τοὺς τῶν τοιῶνδε μηνυτάς. M. de Mandajors (histoire de l'acad. des inscript. tom. 18, p. 226) thinks that the slave was put to death as the betrayer of his master, according to an old law renewed by Trajan; but that the occurrence had been misunderstood by the Christians, and had given rise to the tradition which is found in Tertullian and in the Edictum ad comm. Asiae (see above note 10), that an emperor, at this period had decreed the punishment of death for denouncing a Christian. So also Neander, KG. i. i. 201. Certainly such a law against the denunciation of masters

SECOND CHAPTER.

HERETICS.

§ 43.

JEWISH CHRISTIANS.

(Comp. § 32.)

Giesceler's Abhandl. v. d. Nazaräern u. Ebioniten, Stäudlin's u. Tzchirner's Archiv. Bd. 4, St. 2, S. 325 ff.

The Jewish Christians in Palestine were severely persecuted by *Bar Cochba*, (§ 38) because they would not attach themselves to him;[1] and they must afterwards have suffered similar oppression as his followers generally, from whom they were not externally distinguished. These circumstances caused many of them, now that a church of heathen converts had been collected in Jerusalem, where *they* were forbidden to remain, to separate themselves entirely from Judaism, and to join the Christian community.[2] Still, however, the different parties of Jewish Chris-

by slaves was passed under Nerva (Dio Cassius lxviii., p. 769. Cf. Capitolinus in vita Pertinac, c. 9. Digest. lib. xlix. tit. 14, l. 2, § 6): on the contrary, it was also a law (Julius Paulus sententt. receptt. tit. 16, § 4): servo, qui ultro aliquid de domino confitetur, fides non accommodatur (cf. Digest. lib. xlviii. tit. 18, l. 1, § 5 u. § 16, l. 9, § 1); and though the case of high treason (causa Majestatis) was excepted, yet then the punishment of the slaves also was remitted, if they had made a well-grounded accusation (Cod. Justinian. lib. ix. tit. 2, l. 20). Comp. on all these laws, Gothofredus in comm. ad Cod. Theodos. lib. x. tit. 10, c. 17. J. A. Bachii D. Trajanus, sive de legibus Trajani Imp. Lips. 1747. 8. p. 73 ss. According to these principles of law, therefore, either Apollonius only, or his slave only, could have been put to death, but in no case both. Jerome does not say either that Severus was the slave of Apollonius, or that he was executed; and since Eusebius grounds this execution expressly on a supposititious law, it may have belonged only to the oriental tradition, which may have adduced this instance in support of the alleged law.

[1] Justin. apol. i. c. 31. Euseb. in chronico. Hieron. catal. c. 21.

[2] Euseb. iv. 5 enumerates down to this time fifteen bishops of Jerusalem belonging to the circumcision. Probably during the dispersion of the church several of them were contemporary. Ibid. c. 6. Cf. Sulpic. Sever. hist. sacr. ii. 31. Militum cohortem (Hadrianus) custodias in

tians[3] continued down to the fourth century, and even later. In what way the *Nazarenes* and the Gentile Christians still looked upon one another as orthodox, is evident from the explanations of *Hegesippus* on his journey to Rome, whither he arrived under bishop Anicetus (157—161).[4] But since the Gentile Christians looked upon the Nazarenes as weak Christians, on account of their adherence to the Mosaic law,[5] the connection between them became always less intimate, the knowledge of their creed more indistinct; but at the same time, since they did not keep pace with the progressive development of doctrine in the catholic church, the actual difference between the two parties was greater, until at length Epiphanius (about 400) went so far as to include the Nazarenes in his list of heretics (haer. xxix.).

§ 44.

GNOSTICS.

Sources. Irenaeus adv. haereses (especially against Valentinus). Tertullianus adv. Marcionem libb. v.; de praescriptionibus haereticorum; adv. Valentinianos; contra Gnosticos scorpiacum. Epiphanius adv. haereses. Clemens Alex. and Origen in many passages. The work of the neo-Platonic Plotinus *πρὸς τοὺς γνωστικούς*, i. e. Ennead. ii. lib. 9. (ed. G. A. Heigl. Ratisbonae 1832, 8. Comp. Creuzer in the theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1834, ii. 337. Baur's Gnosis, S. 417.)

Isaac de Beausobre histoire critique de Manichée et du Manichéisme. Amstérd. 1734 and 39, 2 T. 4. J. L. Moshemii de rebus Christian. ante Const. M. comm.

perpetuum agitare jussit, quae Judaeos omnes Hierosolymae aditu arceret. Quod quidem christianae fidei proficiebat, quia tum paene omnes Christum Deum sub legis observatione credebant. Nimirum id Domino ordinante dispositum, ut legis servitus a libertate fidei atque ecclesiae tolleretur. Ita tum primum Marcus ex gentilibus apud Hierosolymam episcopus fuit.

[3] See respecting them above, § 32.

[4] Eusebius iv. 22. Hegesippus had conferred with many bishops, particularly with Primus in Corinth and Anicetus at Rome, and testifies on this point: *ἐν ἑκάστῃ δὲ διαδοχῇ καὶ ἐν ἑκάστῃ πόλει οὕτως ἔχει, ὡς ὁ νόμος κηρύττει καὶ οἱ Προφῆται καὶ ὁ Κύριος.* The Nazarenes might find the life of the Gentile Christians conformed to the law, because the latter observed the precepts of Noah, see § 17, note 7, § 26, note 6. An Ebionite would have required the observance of the Mosaic law. Against Baur (Tübinger Zeitschr. 1831, iv. 171) and Schwegler (Montanismus S. 276), who think that he was an Ebionite, see Schliemann's Clementinen. S. 428.

[5] Justin. dial. cum Tryphone, c. 47.

p. 333 ss. Walch's Ketzerhistorie i. 217. (F. Münter's) Versuch über die kirchl. Alterthümer der Gnostiker. Anspach 1790, 8. E. A. Lewald comm. de doctrina gnostica Heidelberg 1818, 8. Aug. Neander's genetische Entwickelung d. vornehmsten gnostischen Systeme. Berlin 1818, 8. (Comp. my Review in the Hall. A. L. Z. April 1823, S. 825 ff.) Neander's KG. i. ii. 632. Histoire critique du Gnosticisme par J. Matter, 2 tom. Paris. 1828, 8. (comp. my Review in the theol. Studien u. Kritiken. 1830, ii. 378 ff.) Die christl. Gnosis, od. d. christl. Religionsphilosophie in ihrer geschichtl. Entwicklung v. Dr F. Baur. Tübingen 1835, 8. Dr H. Ritter's Gesch. d. christl. Philosophie (Hamburg 1841) i. 111. [An Inquiry into the heresies of the apostolic age, by E. Burton, D.D., Oxford, 1829.]

The tendency of theological speculation, which was before apparent in Cerinthus (§ 36), appeared at the commencement of this period completely developed in the different Syrian and Egyptian systems.[1] The philosophical basis of this speculation

[1] Sources of Gnosis, Lewald l. c. p. 60 ss. The church fathers derived it from the heathen philosophy, especially from Platonism (Tert. adv. Hermog. c. 8: haereticorum patriarchae philosophi. De anima c. 23: Plato omnium haereticorum condimentarius), and class its theosophic fantasies with the heathen myths. Down to Mosheim, most writers were in favour of the Platonic origin of Gnosis. So also Tiedemann Geist der speculativen philosophie iii. 96. Derivation from the Jewish Cabbala, Jo. Croji conjecturae in quaedam loca Origenes, Irenaei, &c., appended to Grabe's Irenaeus. F. Buddei diss. de haeresi Valentiniana, annexed to the introd. ad histor. philos. Hebraeorum, ed. 2. Halae 1720, 8. p. 619 ss., Jac. Basnage histoire des Juifs, liv. iii. p. 718 ss. From an oriental philosophy. (= x), especially Mosheim: comp. F. Lücke in Schleiermacher's, de Wette's, u. Lücke's theol. Zeitschr. ii. 138. From the Zendsystem, Lewald l. c. p. 106 ss. Comp. on the other side, A. L. Z. April 1823, S. 828. The writings of Zoroaster, to which some Gnostics appeal (Porphyrius in vita Plotini, p. 10. Clemens Alex. strom. i. 304), are unquestionably of Greek origin. From the Buddhist doctrines, by J. J. Schmidt über die Verwandtschaft der gnostisch-theosoph. Lehren. mit d. Religionssystemen des Orients, vorzüglich des Buddhaismus. Leipsig 1828, 4to. Comp. his treatises on Buddhism in the Mémoires de l'Académie impériale des sciences de S. Petersbourg. vi. Série. Sciences polit., Histoire, Philologie. T. i. livr. ii. (1830) p. 89, livr. iii. p. 221, T. ii. livr. i. (1832) p. 1, 41. (See theol. Studien u. Krit. Jahrg. 1830, ii. 374.) According to Möhler (Vers. über d. Ursprung d. Gnosticismus, in his Schriften u. Aufsätzen, i. 403), Gnosis proceeded directly and entirely from Christianity, and from a practical motive, viz. from an exaggerated contempt of the world, which afterwards endeavoured to lay a speculative foundation for itself, and for this purpose applied all that was useful in the older systems of philosophy, theosophy, and mythology. According to Baur (Gnosis S. 36), Gnosis has borrowed its material substance from the religions which were given historically, its chief object being to inquire into and define the relation in which those historical elements stood to one another. Its first elements were formed among the Alex-

was the old question, *πόθεν τὸ κακόν*.[2] In proportion as the idea of the highest divinity had developed itself, the less did philosophy believe itself right in venturing[3] to consider him as a world-creator (*δημιουργός*),[4] and the more strongly was it disposed to derive the imperfect good in the world from a lower being, but the evil from an evil principle.[5] Among the speculating Christians,

andrian Jews. Persian dualism, platonism, and Alexandrian philosophy of religion, have had their influence in originating the Christian gnosis. It is an attempt to conceive the entire course of the world, as the series of moments in which the absolute spirit presents himself objectively, and unites himself with those moments, and has therefore nothing more similar than the Hegelian philosophy of religion. (Comp. this author's Krit. Studien über d. Begriff d. Gnosis, in the theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1837, iii. 511.) [An Inquiry into the Heresies of the Apostolic Age. By E. Burton, D.D. Oxford, 1829, 8vo.]

[2] Tertull. de praescript. haeret. c. 7. Eaedem materiae apud haereticos et philosophos volutantur, iidem retractatus implicantur, unde malum et quare? et unde homo et quomodo? et quod proxime Valentinus proposuit, unde deus? Euseb. hist. eccl. v. 27, *πολυθρύλλητον παρὰ τοῖς αἱρεσιώταις ζήτημα τὸ πόθεν ἡ κακία*.

[3] Even according to Plato (Timaeus p. 41), only the divine in man was created by the highest God, who then leaves it to the *τοῖς νέοις θεοῖς ἀθανάτῳ θνητὸν προσυφαίνειν*. So also Philo (de mundi opif. p. 16, de ling. conf. p. 346, de profug. p. 460), in speaking of the creation of man, makes the *τὸ ἄλογον, τὸ θνητὸν ἡμῶν τῆς ψυχῆς μέρος* be created by angels. But Lucretius (70 B.C.) de rerum natura v. 196 ss.:—

> Quod si jam rerum ignorem primordia quae sint,
> Hoc tamen ex ipsis coeli rationibus ausim
> Confirmare, aliciscque ex rebus reddere multeis,
> Nequaquam nobis divinitus esse paratum
> Naturam rerum: tanta stat praedita culpa.

[4] *δημιουργός* is the former of the world even in Xenoph. memorab. i. 4, 7, and in Plato Timaeus, p. 41, more frequently in the younger Platonists.

[5] Plutarchus de Iside et Osiride c. 45: *Οὔτε γὰρ ἐν ἀψύχοις σώμασι τὰς τοῦ παντὸς ἀρχὰς θετέον, ὡς Δημόκριτος καὶ Ἐπίκουρος· οὔτε ἀποίου δημιουργὸν ὕλης ἕνα λόγον καὶ μίαν πρόνοιαν, ὡς οἱ Στωϊκοί, περιγινομένην ἀπάντων καὶ κρατοῦσαν· ἀδύνατον γὰρ ἢ φλαῦρον ὁτιοῦν, ὅπου πάντων, ἢ χρηστόν, ὅπου μηδενὸς ὁ θεὸς αἴτιος, ἐγγενέσθαι*. Hence the ancient opinion of the wise men is this: *ἀπὸ δυεῖν ἐναντίων ἀρχῶν, καὶ δυεῖν ἀντιπάλων δυνάμεων—ὅ, τε βίος μικτὸς, ὅ, τε κόσμος—ἀνώμαλος καὶ ποικίλος γέγονε καὶ μεταβολὰς πάσας δεχόμενος*. c. 46: *καὶ δοκεῖ τοῦτο τοῖς πλείστοις καὶ σοφωτάτοις. Νομίζουσι γὰρ οἱ μὲν θεοὺς εἶναι δύο, καθάπερ ἀντιτέχνους, τὸν μὲν γὰρ ἀγαθῶν, τὸν δὲ φαύλων δημιουργόν· οἱ δὲ τὸν μὲν ἀμείνονα θεὸν, τὸν δὲ ἕτερον Δαίμονα καλοῦσιν*. Zoroaster calls the former Ormuzd, the latter Ahriman, *μέσον δὲ ἀμφοῖν τὸν Μίθρην εἶναι· διὸ καὶ Μίθρην Πέρσαι τὸν μεσίτην ὀνομάζουσιν· ἐδίδαξε μὲν τῷ εὐκταῖα θύειν καὶ χαριστήρια, τῷ δὲ ἀποτρόπαια καὶ σκυθρωπά*. c. 48: *Χαλδαῖοι δὲ τῶν πλανητῶν τοὺς θεοὺς γενέσθαι, οὓς καλοῦσι, δύο μὲν ἀγαθουργούς, δύο δὲ κακοποιούς, μέσους δὲ τοὺς τρεῖς ἀποφαίνουσι καὶ κοινούς*. This dualism is found also among the philosophers,

these ideas maintained a firm existence in the Christian view taken of Christianity, Judaism, and heathenism, as the complete, the incomplete, and the evil. These three religions appeared as revelations of three corresponding principles, which were first perceived in their true light from the position of Christianity. Matter (ὕλη) was the evil principle, which, considered either with original or first developed consciousness, had revealed itself in heathenism.[6] The creation of the world belonged, according to Gen. i., to the God of the Jews, who, commonly regarded as the first of the seven planet-princes,[7] proceeded from the highest God only at an infinite distance, and was as incapable of willing the perfect, as of restraining the opposition of matter.[8] On the other hand, the highest divinity was revealed

even in Plato, who speaks in the clearest manner concerning it, ἐν τοῖς νόμοις (Leg. x. p. 669, and Tim. p. 528) οὐ μιᾷ ψυχῇ κινεῖσθαι τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλὰ πλείοσιν ἴσως, δυοῖν δὲ πάντως οὐκ ἐλάττοσιν· ὧν τὴν μὲν ἀγαθουργὸν εἶναι, τὴν δὲ ἐναντίαν ταύτῃ, καὶ τῶν ἐναντίων δημιουργόν· ἀπολειπει δε καὶ τρίτην τινὰ μεταξὺ φύσιν, οὐκ ἄψυχον, οὐδὲ ἄλογον, οὐδὲ ἀκίνητον ἐξ αὐτῆς,—ἀλλ' ἀνακειμένην ἀμφοῖν ἐκείναις, ἐφιεμένην δὲ τῆς ἀμείνονος ἀεί, καὶ ποθοῦσαν, καὶ διώκουσαν. Similar to it is the Egyptian doctrine, in which Osiris is the good, Typhon the evil principle, and Isis that third nature. Numenius περὶ τἀγαθοῦ (in Euseb. praep. evang. xi. 18) shows that the Demiurgus must be distinguished from the highest God, who, as he thinks, resembles the Logos of Philo: τὸν μὲν πρῶτον θεὸν ἀργὸν εἶναι, ἔργων ξυμπάντων καὶ βασιλέα, τὸν δημιουργικὸν δὲ θεὸν ἡγεμόνειν, ὃι' οὐρανοῦ ἰόντα. διὰ δε τοὐτου καὶ ὁ στόλος ἡμῖν ἐστι, κάτω τοῦ νοῦ πεμπομένου ἐν διεξόδῳ πᾶσι τοῖς κοινωνῆσαι συντεταγμένοις· And in a preceding passage: Καὶ γὰρ οὔτε δημιουργεῖν ἐστι χρεὼν τὸν πρῶτον, καὶ τοῦ δημιουργοῦντος δε θεοῦ χρὴ εἶναι καὶ νομίζεσθαι πατέρα τὸν πρῶτον θεόν.

Analogous to the Jewish-Christian view, according to which the heathen gods were evil angels. Keilii opusc. ii. 584, 601.

7 The Jewish-Christian opinion of the division of the world among angels corresponded to this. Keil l. c. p. 480.

8 Origen de princ. l. iv. (Philocalia ed. Spencer, p. 6): οἵ τε ἀπὸ τῶν αἱρέσεων ἀναγινώσκοντες τό· πῦρ ἐκκέκαυται ἐκ τοῦ θυμοῦ μου (Jer. xv. 14, then: Exod. xx. 5, 1 Reg. xv. 11, Es. xlv. 8, Am. iii. 6, Mich. i. 12, 1 Reg. xvi. 15), καὶ μυρία ὅσα τούτοις παραπλήσια, ἀπιστῆσαι μὲν ὡς θεοῦ ταῖς γραφαῖς οὐ τετολμήκασι, πιστεύοντες δε αὐτὰς εἶναι τοῦ δημιουργοῦ, ᾧ Ἰουδαῖοι λατρεύουσιν, ᾠήθησαν ὡς ἀτελοῦς καὶ οὐκ ἀγαθοῦ τυγχάνοντος τοῦ δημιουργοῦ, τὸν σωτῆρα ἐπιδεδημηκέναι τελειότερον καταγγέλλοντα θεόν, ὃν φασι μὴ τὸν δημιουργὸν τυγχάνειν, διαφόρως περὶ τοὐτου κινούμενοι, καὶ ἅπαξ ἀποστάντες τοῦ δημιουργοῦ, ὃς ἐστιν ἀγέννητος μόνος θεὸς, ἀναπλασμοῖς ἑαυτοὺς ἐπιδεδώκασι, μυθοποιοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς ὑποθέσεις, καθ' ἃς οἴονται γεγονέναι τὰ βλεπόμενα, καὶ ἕτερά τινα μὴ βλεπόμενα, ἅπερ ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτῶν ἀνειδωλοποίησεν. New Testament passages also may have been cited by the Gnostics in favour of the distinction, ex. gr. Joh. xii. 31, xiv. 30; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Gal. iii. 19; 1 Cor. ii. 6, 7; Eph. iii. 9 ff.

by Christ, who, elevated above all being, had produced out of himself only the world of light, a world of blessed spirits. Human spirits, πνεύματα, are rays of light proceeding from this blessed spirit, whose object is consequently to free themselves from the fetters of the Demiurgus and matter, in order that they may return into the world of light. To effect this was the object of Christ, who was thought by most gnostics to be one of the highest spirits of light. As the means of doing so, he left behind to his genuine disciples, the γνῶσις. These general ideas were carried out specifically in the separate schools, on which account they received different forms and modifications. Among the *Alexandrian* Gnostics, traces of the Platonic philosophy are most obvious;[9] among the *Syrian*, the influence of Parsism was superadded. Among the former, the emanation doctrine was pre-eminent; among the latter, *dualism*.[10] In all the schools, however, there remained a wide field for the play of fancy in making vivid to the perception the internal relations of the world of light, the origin of the Demiurgus from it, and the creation of the world. For this purpose the Alexandrian gnostics employed, but only as an insecure guide, a representation which was borrowed from the Platonic doctrine of ideas, that the visible world, with its germs of life, is only an image and impression of the world of light.[11] With this view the allegorical interpretation of holy scripture already current could be readily united, and employed in an arbitrary manner. Moreover, all the gnostics appealed particularly to a secret doctrine handed down

[9] Plotinus contra Gnosticos, c. 6: ὅλως γὰρ αὐτοῖς τὰ μὲν παρὰ τοῦ Πλάτωνος εἴληπται· τὰ δὲ, ὅσα καινοτομοῦσιν, ἵνα ἰδίαν φιλοσοφίαν ᾖ̃σιν, ταῦτα ἔξω τῆς ἀληθείας εὕρηται·

[10] Neander divides the Gnostics into such as adhered to Judaism, and anti-Jewish: see the Hall. A. L. Z. April 1823, S. 831, and Baur's Gnosis, S. 97 ff. The latter assumes three classes; 1. Those who brought Christianity into closer connection with Judaism and heathenism; 2. Those who made a strict separation between Christianity and Judaism and heathenism; 3. Those who identified Christianity and Judaism, and opposed both to heathenism in the form of Gnosis, (the pseudo-Clement. system).

[11] Philo de somniis, p. 593: τὸν ἐκ τῶν ἰδεῶν συνεστῶτα—κόσμον νοητὸν οὐκ ἔνεστιν ἄλλως καταλαβεῖν, ὅτι μὴ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ αἰσθητοῦ καὶ ὁρωμένου τούτου μεταναβάσεως. So, according to Hebr. ix. 23 the earthly sanctuary contains ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Clem. Alex. strom. iv. p. 593: Εἰκὼν τῆς οὐρανίου ἐκκλησίας ἡ ἐπίγειος. So, particularly in the system of the Valentians, Iren. ii. 7. It is the Sophia, quae emittit similitudines et imagines eorum, quae sursum sunt. c. 8: in honorem eorum, quae sursum sunt, facta sunt haec secundum illorum imaginem.

to them from the apostles. The principle of the gnostic morality, *freedom from the fetters of the Demiurgus, and of matter*, led to rigid abstinence, and a contemplative life. But when the pride of dogmatism among the later gnostics had stifled the moral sense, they partly fell upon the expedient of giving out the moral law to be only a work of the Demiurgus, for the sake of indulgence in several excesses.[12]

§ 45.

(CONTINUATION.) 1. ALEXANDRIAN GNOSTICS.

I. Basilides of Alexandria (about 125) represented seven δυνάμεις in particular, as emanating from the great original (θεὸς ἄῤῥητος) viz. νοῦς, λόγος, φρόνησις, σοφία, δύναμις, δικαιοσύνη, εἰρήνη. These composed the first kingdom of spirits (οὐρανός). From this emanated a second, and so on until there were 365 kingdoms of spirits, each of which was successively an imperfect impression of the preceding. The abstract idea of these spiritual kingdoms, *i. e. God so far as he has reveqled himself*, in contradistinction from *God in himself*, he called Ἀβρασάξ.[1] The seven angels of the lowest heaven, and especially the first among them, ὁ ἄρχων, the God of the Jews, are the creators of the world. To effect the return of human spirits to the world of light (ἀποκατάστασις), the νοῦς

[12] Clement. Alex. strom. iii. p. 529: Αἱρέσεις—ἢ—ἀδιαφόρως ζῆν διδάσκουσιν, ἢ τὸ ὑπέρτονον ἄγουσαι, ἐγκράτειαν διὰ δυσσεβείας καὶ φιλαπεχθημοσύνης καταγγέλλουσι. cf. ii. 411: Plotinus contra Gnosticos, c. 15: ὁ δὲ λόγος οὗτος (τῶν Γνωστικῶν)—τὴν πρόνοιαν μεμψάμενος, καὶ πάντας νόμους τοὺς ἐνταῦθα ἀτιμάσας, καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν—τό, τε σωφρονεῖν τοῦτο ἐν γέλωτι θέμενος, ἵνα μηδὲν καλὸν ἐνταῦθα δὴ ὄφθείη ὑπάρχον, ἀνεῖλε τό, τε σωφρονεῖν καὶ τὴν ἐν τοῖς ἤθεσι σύμφυτον δικαιοσύνην, τὴν τελουμένην ἐκ λόγου καὶ ἀσκήσεως·—ὥστε αὐτοῖς καταλείπεσθαι τὴν ἡδονὴν, καὶ τὸ περὶ αὐτοῦς, καὶ τὸ οὐ κοινὸν πρὸς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους, καὶ τὸ τῆς χρείας μόνον.

[1] J. J. Bellermann Versuch über die Gemmen der Alten mit dem Abraxas-Bilde. Berlin 1817—19. 3 Stücke. U. F. Kopp palaeographia critica P. iii. et iv. Manhemii 1829, 4. Good impressions of many Abraxas-gems are appended to Matter's hist. du Gnosticisme; but many of them are not of Gnostic origin. See theol. Studien u. Kritiken. 1830. Heft. 2. S. 403 ff. Ἀβρασάξ appears as a powerful incantation-name of God, as well as the Jewish Jao, Sabaoth, Adonai, even in magical formulae whose origin is obviously heathen-Egyptian, see C. J. C. Reuvens lettres à M. Letronne sur les Papyrus bilingues et grecs du Musée de Leide. (à Leide 1830, 4). Prem. lettre, p. 22, 64.

united itself with the man Jesus at his baptism. Hence the followers of Basilides celebrated the festival of the baptism as *the epiphany* (τὰ ἐπιφάνια, on the 11th Tybi, the 6th of January).[2] The man alone endured the sufferings, which, like all human sufferings, were expiations of guilt imputed, though in a former period of existence. The ἄρχων of Basilides is not evil, but only circumscribed; and therefore he subjects himself to the higher arrangement of the world, as soon as it is made known to him.[3] The later followers of Basilides, on the contrary, conceived him to be an open adversary of the world of light, and rejected Judaism entirely, in which, however, Basilides could perceive types and preparations for something higher. In like manner, they received into their system the views of the Docetae, and contrived by sophisms to make their moral doctrine more loose. They rendered themselves particularly odious, by supposing that they could deny the crucified One, and so escape persecution. The party was still in existence about 400.[4]

II. Still more ingenious is the system of *Valentinus*, who came from Alexandria to Rome about 140, and died in Cyprus about 160.[5] From the great original, (according to him βυθός,

[2] According to Jablonski de origine festi nativitatis Christi diss. ii. § 8 ss., (Opuscul. ed. te Water iii. 358), they borrowed this day from the Egyptians, who celebrated on it the inventio Osiridis. This application of the Egyptian festival, however, rests on an unfortunate alteration of the text in Plut. de Isis et Osir. c. 39. The festival of the inventio Osiridis occurred in November. See Wyttenbach. animadverss. in Plut. moralia ii. i. 225. Wieseler's chronolog. Synopse der Evang. S. 136. In like manner Jablonski incorrectly infers from Clem. Alex. strom. iii. p. 340, that the followers of Basilides celebrated not only the baptism, but also the birth of Jesus, on the Epiphany.

[3] The genuine system of Basilides is given in Clemens Alexandrinus; that of his later adherents in Irenaeus, see Neander gnost. Systeme, S. 31.

[4] The sources of information concerning Basilides are: the tradition of Glaukias, an interpreter (ἑρμηνεύς) of the apostle Peter, and a tradition of the apostle Matthias.—Prophets Βαρκάβας, Βαρκώφ, Παρχώρ.—He wrote twenty-four books ἐξηγητικά, which may have also been called his gospel.

[5] J. F. Buddeus de haeresi Valentiniana appended to introductio ad historiam philos. Ebraeorum. ed. 2. Halae 1720, 8, p. 573—736. It is remarkable that Valentinus not only received the New Testament, but made constant allegorical use of it in his system. Thus he formed his system of Aeons for the most part after John i. Irenaeus i. 8, 5.—His writings are: secret doctrine of Theodades, a disciple of Paul; hymns, discourses, and letters, for the most part lost. From the

προπάτωρ, προαρχή), with whom is the consciousness of himself, (ἔννοια, σιγή) emanate in succession male and female *aeons*,[6] (Νοῦς or Μονογενής and ἀλήθεια, λόγος and ἀλήθεια, λόγος and ζωή, ἄνθρωπος and ἐκκλησία, &c.) so that 30 aeons together (distinguished into the Ὀγδοάς, Δεκάς and Δωδεκάς) form the πλήρωμα.[7] From the passionate striving of the last aeon, the σοφία, to unite with *Bythos* itself, arises an untimely being (ἡ κάτω σοφία, ἐνθύμησις, Ἀχαμώθ *i. e.* חָכְמוֹת), which, wandering about outside the pleroma, communicates the germ of life to matter, and forms the Δημιουργός of psychical material, who immediately creates the world. In this three kinds of material are mixed, τὸ πνευματικόν, τὸ ψυχικόν, τὸ ὑλικόν. The result of the course of the world is, that the two first should be separated from the last, and that τὸ πνευμ. should return to the pleroma, τὸ ψυχικόν into the τόπος μεσότητος, where the *Achamoth* now dwells. In the mean time, two new aeons, Christ and the Holy Spirit, had arisen, in order to restore the disturbed harmony in the pleroma; then there emanated from all the aeons, Jesus (σωτήρ), who, as future associate (σύζυγος) of the Achamoth, shall lead back into the pleroma this and the pneumatic natures. The σωτήρ united itself at the baptism with the psychical Messiah promised by the Demiurgus. Just so is the letter of the doctrines of Jesus for *psychical* men. On the other hand, the spirit introduced by the Soter or Saviour, is for the *spiritual*. These theosophic dreams were naturally capable of being moulded in many different ways; and, accordingly, among Valentine's disciples are found many departures from their teacher. The most important of his followers were *Heracleon*,[8] *Ptolemy*,[9] and *Marcus*.

work preserved in Coptic, entitled Fidelis Sophia, has been published, D. Fr. Münter odae gnosticae. thebaice et latine. Havniae 1812.

[6] On αἰών see Numenius ap. Euseb. praep. evang. xi. 10: τὸ ὂν οὔτε ποτὲ ἦν, οὔτε ποτὲ γένηται· ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἀεὶ ἐν χρόνῳ μὴ ὡρισμένῳ, τῷ ἑνεστῶτι μόνῳ. τοῦτον μὲν οὖν τὸν ἑνεστῶτα εἴ τις ἐθέλει καλεῖν αἰῶνα, κἀγὼ συμβούλομαι. (I have believed it necessary to place the μὴ, which stands in the usual text before γένηται, before ὡρισμένῳ). Thus among the Gnostics αἰῶνες are developments of the Divine Being, who, as such, are elevated above the limitations of time.

[7] On πλήρωμα see Baur's Gnosis, S. 157.

[8] Of his Commentary on John there are numerous fragments in the commentary of Origen.

[9] His epistola ad Floram apud Epiphanius haer. xxxiii. A. Stieren de Ptolemaei Gnostici ad Floram epist. P. I, Jenae 1843, distinguishes

III. To the system of Valentinus was nearly allied that of the *Ophites,*[10] who, perhaps, existed as a party in Egypt even before the Valentinians.[11] Their pleroma is simpler than that of Valentinus. From the Bythus emanate *the first man, the second man* or *the son of man, the holy spirit.* The last gives birth, by means of the first two, to the perfect masculine light-nature, *the Christ,* and the defective female σοφία, Ἀχαμώθ, προυνείκος. The creator of the world (Ἰαλδαβαώθ, probably יַלְדָּא בָּהוּת, son of chaos), the first of the seven planet princes, is ambitious and malevolent, and is therefore involved in continual strife with his mother Sophia, who endeavours to deprive him of the pneumatic natures. The Ὀφιόμορφος, the ruler of Hyle, and the cause of all evil, is an image of him. The christology of the Ophites is altogether like that of Valentinus, with this difference, that *Jesus* is the *psychical, Christ* the *pneumatic* Messiah.[12] The Ophites were divided into various sects, (ex. gr. *Sethians, Cainites*). One of them looked for the Sophia in the serpent of Genesis, and hence the name of the whole party. This continued the longest of all the Gnostic sects. (So late as 530 A.D. Justinian enacted laws against them, Cod. lib. i. tit. v. 1, 18, 19, 21).

IV. *Carpocrates* struck out an entirely different way.[13] In his view, *Jesus* was a mere man, like Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle, who had set an example of the mode in which the

in the letter two parts proceeding from different authors, both which, however, could not have been written by Ptolemy.

[10] J. L. v. Mosheim Versuch einer unparteiischen u. gründlichen Ketzergeschichte. Geschichte der Schlangenbrüder der ersten Kirche. 2te Aufl. Helmstädt 1748, 4. A. H. L. Fuldner comm. de Ophitis. Part. 1. Rintelli 1834, 4. (A school programm).

[11] Origen c. Celsum. vi. § 28, ed. Spenc. p. 294: Ὀφιανοὶ τοσοῦτον ἀποδέουσι τοῦ εἶναι Χριστιανοί, ὥστε οὐκ ἔλαττον Κέλσου κατηγορεῖν αὐτοὺς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. καὶ μὴ πρότερον προσίεσθαί τινα ἐπὶ τὸ συνέδριον ἑαυτῶν, ἐὰν μὴ ἀρὰς θῆται κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Mosheim (l. c. S. 19 and S. 127) infers from this that the Ophites formed a more ancient Jewish sect, which afterwards adopted Christianity only in part. On the other side see A. L. Z. April 1823. S. 846.

[12] On the διάγραμμα of the Ophites apud Origenes c. Celsum vi. ed. Spencer. p. 291 ss., see Mosheim l. c. S. 79 ff., 178 ff.

[13] G. H. F. Fuldner de Carpocratianis, in Illgen's historischtheolog. Abhandlungen, dritte Denkschrifft der hist. theol. Gesellschaft zu Leipzig. 1824. S. 180 ff. G. Gesenius de inscriptione Phoenicio-Graeca in Cyrenaica nuper reperta ad Carpocratianorum haeresin pertinente. Halae 1825, 4.

Gnostic must free himself from the Demiurgi (ἄγγελοι κοσμοποιοί), and unite with the highest divinity (μονάς). As the Carpocratians had portraits of those Grecian philosophers and of Jesus in their sanctuaries, so they built in Cephalenia a temple to *Epiphanes*,[14] a youth seventeen years old, the son of their founder, after his death. The sects of the *Antitactes* and the *Prodiciani*,[15] allied to the Carpocratians, were branded like it by immoral principles.[16]

§ 46.

(CONTINUATION.) 2. SYRIAN GNOSTICS.

The Syrian Gnostics developed the doctrine of dualism more decidedly than the Egyptian, to which the neighbourhood of Persia may have largely contributed. With this was connected their fanatical asceticism, in which they exceeded the Egyptians,

[14] Fragments of his work περὶ δικαιοσύνης preserved by Clemens Alex. strom. iii. p. 512 s. His moral principles: οἱ νόμοι, ἀνθρώπων ἀμαθίαν κολάζειν μὴ δυνάμενοι, παρανομεῖν ἐδίδαξαν· ἡ γὰρ ἰδιότης τῶν νόμων τὴν κοινωνίαν τοῦ θείου νόμου κατέτεμεν καὶ παρατρώγει.—Κοινῇ ὁ θεὸς ἅπαντα ἀνθρώπῳ ποιήσας, καὶ τὸ θῆλυ τῷ ἄῤῥενι κοινῇ συναγαγών, καί πάνθ' ὁμοίως τὰ ζῶα κολλήσας, τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἀνέφηνεν κοινωνίαν μετ' ἰσότητος. Hence, according to page 514, at the conclusion of their agapae, concubitus promiscui.

[15] On the Ἀντιτάκται cf. Clemens strom. iii. p. 526. Theodoret. haer. fab. comp. i. c. 16: Respecting Πρόδικος Clemens *l.* c. p. 525. Theodoret. *l.* c. i. c. 6.

[16] The inscriptions which, as pretended, were found in Cyrene, and were regarded at first as Carpocratian (cf. G. Gesenius l. c.), were afterwards shown to be recent fabrications, like many other spurious productions, particularly Eumali Cyrenaici hist. Libycae lib. vi.tus, which were made known collectively by the Marquis Fortia d'Urban in Avignon. They were meant to confirm the hypotheses which this person had formerly put forth respecting an island, Atlantis, in the Mediterranean Sea which was sunk at the flood, in which island a St Simonian community of gods and wives is said to have prevailed. See Boeckh preface to the Berlin Lectionskataloge, Easter, 1832. Gesenius in the Hallische A. L. Z. 1835. August, S. 462. When M. J. R. Pacho relation d'un voyage dans la Marmarique, la Cyrénaique, &c. Paris 1827. 4. p. 128, believed that he had found in a pit at Lameloudèh, in Cyrenaica, traces referring to a place where the Carpocratians assembled, he was led astray by the opinions at first pronounced on those inscriptions. A cross with a serpent is a common Christian symbol, according to John iii. 14; and Catholic Christians may as well have used that pit as a place of meeting, like those at Massakhit, p. 114.

and their *Docetic* views.[1] *Saturninus* in Antioch, a contemporary of Basilides, taught that by the original cause (πατὴρ ἄγνωστος) the world of spirits was created by successive steps, and placed in the lowest gradation the spirits of the seven planets (ἄγγελοι κοσμοκράτορες). In opposition to them stood the evil principle (ὁ Σατανᾶς), who set in antagonism to the race of men of light animated by the highest divinity, a race of evil men, so that both kinds of men are continued beside one another. In order to avoid all contact with the evil principle, the followers of Saturninus abstained from marriage and the eating of flesh. The wide diffusion of the Gnostic opinions in Syria and the countries lying eastward of it may be seen in the case of *Bardesanes* in Edessa (about 172),[2] who, although he believed in two eternal principles, derived evil from the Hyle, and held many other Gnostic tenets, was still looked upon as orthodox in that place. Contemporary with him was the Assyrian *Tatian*,[3] who had been a disciple of Justin Martyr, but after his death had returned to his native land, and founded there a Gnostic sect, which was chiefly distinguished by abstinence (Ἐγκρατῖται, Ὑδροπαραστάται, *Aquarii*),[4] and continued till after the fourth century.

[1] A. L. Z. April 1823. S. 833 ff.

[2] Bar daizon (Bayer hist. Osrh. et Edess. p. 13) lived under the prince Abgar bar Maanu, and gave up his book, περὶ εἱμαρμένης, to Antoninus Verus, of which Euseb. praep. Evang. vi. 10, has preserved a fragment (republished in Alexandri Aphrodisiensis, Ammonii, Plotini, Bardesanis et Gemisti Plethonis de fato quae supersunt graece, rec. et notas adjecit J. C. Orellius. Turici, 1824. 8. p. 202 ss). He gained over many adherents by his hymns. The fifty-six hymns of Ephraem Syrus against heretics are important for the knowledge of his system. Cf. Bardesanes Gnosticus Syrorum primus hymnologus, comm. historico-theol. quam scripsit Aug. Hahn. Lips. 1819. 8. C. Kuehner astronomiae et astrologiae in doctrina Gnosticorum vestigia. p. i. Bardesanis Gnostici numina astralia. Hildburghusae, 1833. 8.

[3] Tatianus d. Apologet v. Dr H. A. Daniel. Halle, 1837, S. 253. Respecting his εὐαγγέλιον διὰ τεσσάρων, see Credner's Beiträge zur Einl. in d. bibl. Schriften. i. 437.

[4] These names, as well as the appellation Docetae, certainly designate a heresy, which was common to many parties; but they appear to have been specially given to the followers of Tatian, because a particular sect-name for them does not appear.

§ 47.

(CONTINUATION.) 3. MARCION AND HIS SCHOOL.[1]

The Gnosis of *Marcion*, the son of a bishop of *Sinope*, who attached himself to the Syrian *Cerdo* at Rome (between 140 and 150), and developed there a system of his own, has a character quite peculiar. He assumed three moral principles (ἀρχαί), viz. the θεὸς ἀγαθός, the δημιουργὸς δίκαιος, and the ὕλη (ὁ πονηρός, ὁ διάβολος). To free men,—who had only to expect from the Demiurgus, according to the principles of strict justice, either condemnation or at most a limited happiness,—to free them, I say, from such a yoke, Christ suddenly descended into Capernaum with the appearance of a body, and proclaimed to men the good deity hitherto unknown. Those who believe in Christ, and lead a new, holy life, from love to the good deity, will be blessed with happiness in his heavenly kingdom, while others are left to the strict justice of the Demiurgus. Marcion required of the perfect Christians a strictly ascetic life, abstinence from marriage, avoidance of all earthly pleasures, and restriction to a few simple articles of diet. But all the disciples of this school were not faithful (fideles). Many continued catechumens for a long time. Marcion's gospel (εὐαγγέλιον) was that of Luke, mutilated according to his system; in addition to which, he used ten of the Pauline epistles (ὁ ἀπόστολος), not, however, without corruption.[2]

[1] Particular sources: Tertull. adv. Marcionem libri v.—(Pseudo-) Origenis διάλογος περὶ τῆς εἰς θεὸν ὀρθῆς πίστεως s. dial. contra Marcionitas (ed. J. R. Wetstein. Basil. 1674, 4). The credibility of the fathers respecting Marcion is too much doubted by H. Rhode prolegomenorum ad quaestionem de Evangelio Apostoloque Marcionis denuo instituendam cap. i.—iii. Vratislav. 1834, 4. See on the other side Ch. E. Becker examen crit. de l'évangile de Marcion. Première partie. Strasbourg 1837, 4. Works on the subject: Neander gnost. Syst. S. 276 ff. Aug. Hahn diss. de gnosi Marcionis antinomi. Regiomonti 4. (Two Christmas programmes of 1820 and 1821). Ejusd. antitheses Marcionis Gnostici liber deperditus, nunc quoad ejus fieri potuit restitutus. Regiom. 1823, 8. The same author's das Evangelium Marcion's in seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt, nebst dem vollständigsten Beweise dargestellt, dass es nicht selbstständig, sondern ein verstümmeltes und verfälschtes Lucas-Evangelium war. Königsb. 1823, 8. Compare my review in the Hall. A. L. Z. Oct. 1823, S. 225 ff.

[2] The adulteration was first doubted by J. S. Semler in his paraphra-

In a work entitled "Antitheses," he endeavoured to prove the different characters of Judaism and Christianity, by means of positions from both set over against one another.

Respecting metaphysical relations, as far as they do not affect the moral interests of men, no declarations are found in Marcion. His disciples, therefore, borrowed such principles partly from the Syrian Gnostics, partly, like *Apelles*, from the Valentinians, so that the school of Marcion was afterwards divided into many branches.[3]

§ 48.

MONTANISTS AND ALOGI.

Defenders of the Montanists are: Nic. Rigaltius in praefat. ad Tertulliani opp. Arnold's Kirchen und Ketzerhistorie, Th. 1, Bd. 2, K. 4, § 44. Gottlieb Wernsdorf de Montanistis saeculi secundi haereticis comm. Gedani 1751, 4. More impartial are: Mosheim de rebus Christ. ante Const. M. p. 410 ss. Walch's Ketzerhist. i. 611. Full of peculiar combinations is: Dr F. C. A. Schwegler's der Montanismus u. d. christl. Kirche d. 2ten Jahrh. Tübingen 1841, 8.—M. Merkel's hist. krit. Aufklärung der Streitigkeit der Aloger über

sis epist. ad Galatas. Hal. 1779, 8. Prolegom. § 2, 3. Then by Chr. F. J. Loeffler diss., qua Marcionem Pauli epistolas et Lucae evangel. adulterasse dubitatur. Traj. ad. Viadr. 1788, 4, (reprinted in the Commentatt. theol. coll. a Kuinoel et Ruperti. vol. i. p. 180 ss.) On this the hypothesis was built upon by H. Corodi, J. G. Eichhorn, and J. E. Ch. Schmidt. Of another opinion is Dr Gratz krit. Untersuchung über Marcion's Evangel. Tübing. 1818, 8. Comp. especially Hahn's Evang. Marcion's, &c. Ejusd. diss. de canone Marcionis. P. i. Regiom. 1824, 4. Ejusd. evang. Marcionis ex auctoritate vett. monumentorum descriptum, in J. C. Thilo cod. apocryph. N. T. I. 401. Becker l. c.

[3] Even Rhodon (ap. Euseb. v. 13) says: *διὰ τοῦτο καὶ παρ' ἑαυτοῖς ἀσύμφωνοι γεγόνασιν, ἀπὸ γὰρ τῆς τούτων ἀγέλης Ἀπελλῆς μὲν—μίαν ἀρχὴν ὁμολογεῖ—ἕτεροι δὲ, καθὼς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ ναύτης Μαρκίων, δύο ἀρχὰς εἰσηγοῦνται—ἄλλοι δὲ πάλιν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον ἐξοκείλαντες, ὡς μόνον δύο, ἀλλὰ καὶ τρεῖς ὑποστῆσαι φύσεις.* Comp. A. L. Z. l. c. S. 226 ff. The thoroughly practical tendency of the true Marcionites is expressed particularly in what Apelles said to Rhodon. (l. c.): *μὴ δεῖν ὅλως ἐξετάζειν τὸν λόγον, ἀλλ' ἕκαστον ὡς πεπίστευκε διαμένειν. σωθήσεσθαι γὰρ τοὺς ἐπὶ τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον ἠλπικότας ἀπεφαίνετο, μόνον ἐὰν ἐν ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς εὑρίσκωνται. τὸ δὲ πάντων ἀσαφέστατον ἐδογματίζετο αὐτῷ πρᾶγμα—τὸ περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ.* Thus, it is not incredible that, as Tertullian, de praescr. c. 30, relates, Marcion at the close of his life wished to return to the Catholic Church. He may have perceived that the practical interests of Christianity were more injured than promoted by his opposition, and that they had sufficient support even in the Catholic church.

die Apokalypsis. Frankf. u. Leipz. 1782, 8. F. A. Heinichen de Alogis, Theodotianis atque Artemonitis. Lips. 1829, 8. Dr L. Lange's Gesch. und Lehrbegriff der Unitarier. Leipzig 1831, S. 156.—Neander's KG. i. ii. 877.

As a peculiar impress is stamped on Christianity in all countries by the national character, so also in Phrygia it could not but experience the influence of the popular tendency to a sensuous, enthusiastic worship of deity. The doctrines of supernatural gifts of the spirit,[1] the renunciation of the earthly, and the millennial reign, were susceptible of such development.[2] These subjects appear to have been peculiar favourites in Phrygia very early,[3] where the oppression of persecution, and opposition to the speculations of the Gnostics, may have accelerated their one-sided development. Accordingly, *Montanus*,[4] at *Pepuza* (about 150),[5] in an ecstatic state,[6] began to announce, that the *Paraclete*

[1] As they continued among the Christians even after Justin and Irenaeus. Schwegler S. 94.

[2] As far as Montanism proceeded out of these doctrines, Schwegler designates it as a development of Ebionitism, which had been prevalent up to that time in the church; but he arbitrarily understands by Ebionitism the entire Jewish basis of Christianity.

[3] Ex. gr. Philip and his daughters in Hierapolis (to whom the Montanist Proculus against Caius refers, Euseb. iii. 31), Papias (§ 35, not. 7).

[4] According to Didymus de Trin. lib. iii. cap. penult., he had formerly been ἱερεὺς εἰδώλου. Jerome ep. 27 ad Marcellam calls him abscissum et semivirum. He appears accordingly to have been a priest of Cybele, a circumstance which must have been then of importance in his conception of Christianity. Schwegler, S. 243, may declare Montanus to be a mythic personage, but younger contemporaries, the anonymous writer in Euseb. v. 17, and Apollonius l. c. v. 18, mention him.

[5] According to Apollonius, who wrote under Commodus, Montanus had appeared forty years before (apud. Euseb. v. 18). This is the oldest and safest account. Eusebius in his Chronicle places the commencement of Montanism in the year 172; Epiphanius haer. li. 33 in the year 135; and haer. xlviii. 1, in the year 157.

[6] Following the example of Philo, Justin and Athenagoras also consider the state of prophetic inspiration as an ecstasis. The former (coh. ad. Graecos p. 9) compares the prophets during it to a lyre which is touched by the Holy Spirit as the plectrum; the latter compares them in the same sense to a flute (Schwegler, S. 100). In like manner the Holy Spirit, through Montanus, describes the ecstasy of the Montanist prophets, apud Epiphan. haer. xlviii. 4: ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος ὡσεὶ λύρα, κἀγὼ ἰπταμαι ὡσεὶ πλῆκτρον· ὁ ἄνθρωπος κοιμᾶται, κἀγὼ γρηγορῶ· ἰδοὺ κύριός ἐστιν ὁ ἐξιστάνων καρδίας ἀνθρώπων, καὶ διδοὺς καρδίας ἀνθρώποις. Tertullian calls the ecstasis which he explains by amentia (lib. de anima c. 11) Sancti Spiritus vis, operatrix prophetiae. That which he describes bears a striking resemblance to magnetic clairvoyance (l. c., c. 9); Est hodie

had imparted itself to him for the purpose of giving the church its manly perfection. Two fanatical women, *Maximilla* and *Priscilla*, attached themselves to him as prophetesses; and thus a party was formed, the adherents of which, vainly presuming that they alone possessed the last revelations of the spirit,[7] as πνευματικοι, full of spiritual arrogance, looked down upon other Christians as ψυχικοί. These new prophets did not wish to alter the received creed, but to confirm it anew.[8] On the other hand, they prescribed new and rigorous fasts,[9] forbade second marriage, attributed extraordinary value to celibacy and martyrdom, manifested profound contempt for every thing earthly, and taught that incontinence, murder, and idolatry, though they did not exclude from the grace of God (*Tertullian de pudic. c.* 3), shut a person out for ever from the church.[10] At the same time, they were not afraid to proclaim aloud the end of the world, and the

soror apud nos revelationum charismata sortita, quas in Ecclesia inter dominica solemnia per ecstasin in spiritu patitur, conversatur cum angelis, aliquando etiam cum Domino, et videt et audit sacramenta, et quorundam corda dinoscit, et medicinas desiderantibus submittit, &c. A similarity also to the speaking with tongues among the Corinthians (1 Cor. xiv.) cannot but be noticed. Schwegler, S. 83.

7 The Montanists had not an uninterrupted series of prophets. The Anon. ap. Euseb. v. 17, wrote in the 14th year after the death of Maximilla, and says, that since then none had boasted of the gift of prophecy. But in the time of Tertullian there was again a Montanist prophetess in Africa, see note 6.

8 So Tertullian adv. Praxeam. c. 2, § 13, appeals to the prophecies of the Paraclete in favour of his doctrine of the Trinity. Schwegler, S. 8.

9 At first there were two yearly, each one continuing a week, with the exception of Saturday and Sunday (Tertullian de jejune. c. 15) afterwards three (Hieron. ep. 27 ad Marcellam), in case the third be not the usual ecclesiastical quadragesimal fast, as Valesius ad Euseb. v. 18, and Schwegler suppose, and which, therefore, Tertullian has not reckoned.

10 Tertull. de virginibus velandis c. 1: Regula quidem fidei una omnino est, sola immobilis, et irreformabilis.—Caetera jam disciplinae et conversationis admittunt novitatem correctionis:—cum propterea Paracletum miserit Dominus, ut, quoniam humana mediocritas omnia semel capere non poterat, paulatim diregeretur et ordinaretur et ad perfectum perduceretur disciplina ab illo vicario Dei Spiritu Sancto. From John xvi. he draws the conclusion that the administratio Paracleti is, quod disciplina dirigitur, quod scripturae revelantur, quod intellectus reformatur, quod ad meliora proficitur. Just as in nature everything ripens gradually, sic et justitia—primo fuit in rudimentis, natura deum metuens. Dehinc per legem et prophetas promovit in infantiam. Dehinc per Evangelium efferbuit in juventutem. Nunc per Paracletum componitur in maturitatem. Compare the other writings of Tertullian in

millennial reign as near at hand.[11] By this means they excited first of all dislike and opposition in their vicinity. Their opponents were satisfied for the most part with disputing their prophetic gift as not genuine;[12] and on this ground alone they were

defence of single monastic institutions, de exhortat. castitatis, de monogamia, de fuga in persecutione, de jejunio adv. Psychicos, de pudicitia.

[11] Maximilla announced, according to Euseb. v. 16, 8: πολέμους ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἀκαταστασίας, according to Epiphan. haer. xlviii. 2: ὅτι μετ' ἐμὲ προφῆτις οὐκέτι ἔσται, ἀλλὰ συντέλεια. Priscilla or Quintilla apud Epiphan. haer. xlix. 1: ἐν ἰδέᾳ γυναικὸς ἐσχηματισμένος ἐν στολῇ λαμπρᾷ ἦλθε πρός με Χρίστος, καὶ ἐνέβαλεν ἐν ἐμοὶ τὴν σοφίαν, καὶ ἀπεκάλυψέ μοι, τουτονὶ τὸν τόπον (τὴν Πεπούζην) εἶναι ἅγιον, καὶ ὧδε τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατιέναι. A collection of Montanist predictions in Wernsdorf de Montanistis § 4, others besides in Didymus Alex. de trinit. lib. iii. cap. penult. Cf. Tertullian. de resurrect. carnis. c. 63: At enim Deus omnipotens—effundens in novissimis diebus de suo spiritu in omnem carnem, in servos suos et ancillas, et fidem laborantem resurrectionis carnalis animavit, et pristina instrumenta manifestis verborum et sensuum luminibus ab omni ambiguitatis obscuritate purgavit.—(Spiritus sanctus) jam omnes retro ambiguitates et quas volunt parabolas, aperta atque perspicua totius sacramenti praedicatione discussit. per novam prophetiam de paracleto inundantem. The same, in a fragment in the Praedestinatus haer. 26: Hoc solum discrepamus (a Psychicis), quod secundas nuptias non recipimus, et prophetiam Montani de futuro judicio non recusamus. How fanatical they were in their expectations may be seen in Tertullian. de spectaculis c. 30: Quale autem spectaculum in proximo est, adventus Domini jam indubitati, jam superbi, jam triumphantis!—Quid admirer, quid videam, ubi gaudeam, ubi exultem, tot spectans reges, qui in coelum recepti nuntiabantur, cum ipso Jove et ipsis suis testibus in imis tenebris congemiscentes! item praesides, persecutores dominici nominis, saevioribus quam ipsi contra Christianos saevierunt flammis insultantibus liquescentes! praeterea sapientes illos philosophos coram discipulis suis una conflagrantibus erubescentes, &c. Tertullian's last work, de spe fidelium, mentioned by him, adv. Marcion. iii. c. 24, was exclusively devoted to this object.

[12] Eusebius iv. 27, and v. 16—19, mentions the polemic writings of Claudius Apollinaris, Miltiades, an anonymous person, (who, according to Jerome cat. c. 37 and 39, was Rhodon; by several modern authors incorrectly supposed to be Asterius Urbanus, cf. Wernsdorf de Montanistes, p. 4), Apollonius, and Serapion, and gives extracts from the last three.—The ἔκστασις of the Montanist prophets gave special offence. It was asserted in opposition that all ἔκστασις is an inspiration proceeding from demons, cf. Anonymus apud Euseb. v. 16, 3, and Miltiadis σύγγραμμα περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν προφήτην ἐν ἐκστάσει λαλεῖν (Euseb. v. 17, 1). Tertull. adv. Marcion. iv. c. 22: defendimus, in causa novae prophetiae, gratiae ecstasin, id est amentiam, convenire. In spiritu enim hono constitutus, praesertim cum gloriam Dei conspicit, vel cum per ipsum Deus loquitur, necesse est excidat sensu, obumbratus scilicet virtute divina:

excluded from communion by the churches of Asia Minor.[13] Some, however, led on by opposition to farther inquiry, began to reject even the support which Montanism had in the doctrines of the church at that time.[14] In this respect, those afterwards called *Alogi* went farthest, who not only denied the continuance of charismata in the church, and millennarianism, but rejected the Apocalypse, and even the gospel of John.[15]

This very mode of opposition, against which, even in Asia Minor, *Melito*, bishop of Sardis, presented himself as an antagonist,[16]

de quo inter nos et Psychicos quaestio est. According to Jerome cat. c. 53, Tertullian also wrote de ecstasi libros vi.

[13] Anonymus ap. Euseb. v. 16, 5.

[14] To this number appear to belong the rejecters of Chiliasm, of whom Irenaeus v. c. 31, says: quidam ex his, qui putantur recte credidisse, supergrediuntur ordinem promotionis justorum,—haereticos sensus in se habentes; u. 32: transferuntur quorundam sententiae ab haereticis sermonibus, &c. Farther, the rejecters of the Apocalypse, of whom Dionysius Alex. περὶ ἐπαγγελιῶν apud Euseb. vii. c. 25, says: τινὲς μὲν οὖν τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἠθέτησαν καὶ ἀνεσκεύασαν πάντῃ τὸ βιβλίον κ. τ. λ., who went so far as to hold Cerinthus to be the author.

[15] Compare especially the above cited work of Merkel, whom also Olshausen (Echtheit der vier canon. Evang. S. 254 ff.) follows. Irenaeus iii. c. 11: Alii vero, ut donum Spiritus frustrentur, quod in novissimis temporibus secundum placitum patris effusum est in humanum genus, illam speciem non admittunt, quae est secundum Joannis evangelium, in qua Paracletum se missurum Dominus promisit; sed simul et evangelium et propheticum repellunt Spiritum. Infelices vere, qui pseudoprophetae [leg. pseudoprophetas] quidem esse volunt, prophetiae vero gratiam ab ecclesia repellunt; similia patientes his, qui propter eos, qui in hypocrisi veniunt, etiam a fratrum communicatione se abstinent. Datur autem intelligi, quod hujusmodi neque apostolum Paulum recipiant. In ea enim epistola, quae est ad Corinthios, de propheticis charismatibus diligenter locutus est, et scit viros et mulieres prophetantes. Per haec igitur omnia peccantes in Spiritum Dei, in irremissibile incidunt peccatum. The name Ἄλογοι appears first in Epiphanius haer. li. adv. Alogos., comp. especially the passage cap. 33, according to the following correction of the text (so Merkel, S. 35 ff.): ἐνοικησάντων γὰρ τούτων ἐκεῖσε (εἰς Θυάτειρα) καὶ τῶν κατὰ Φρύγας, [οἱ μὲν] δίκην λύκων ἁρπαξάντων τὰς διανοίας τῶν ἀκεραίων πίστων, μετήνεγκαν τὴν πᾶσαν πόλιν εἰς τὴν αὐτῶν αἵρεσιν· οἱ δὲ ἀρνούμενοι τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν, τοῦ λόγου τούτου εἰς ἀνατροπὴν, κατ' ἐκείνου καιροῦ ἐστρατεύοντο.

[16] To this subject appear to belong, his works περὶ πολιτείας καὶ προφητῶν, λόγος περὶ προφητείας, περὶ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου. (comp. Lücke's Einl. in d. Offenb. Joh. S. 289). They were naturally very welcome to the Montanists, and hence Melito was praised by Tertullian even in the Montanist period of the latter's life (Hieronymus in catal. c. 24: Hujus elegans et declamatoriam ingenium laudans Tertullianus in septem libris, quos scripsit adversus ecclesiam pro Montano, dicit,

contributed largely, perhaps, to procure Montanism many friends in the west.[17] The western churches never declared themselves exclusively in favour of any of the conflicting parties in Asia;[18] and thus the principles of the Montanists, which were, after all, only the carrying out of orthodox doctrines, could be diffused there,[19] without the necessity of a Montanist party separating itself from the rest of the church.

The Montanists in Asia, who had their peculiar ecclesiastical constitution,[20] continued down to the sixth century.[21] Besides their usual names, *Montanistae, Cataphryges* (*οἱ κατὰ Φρύγας*), other appellations were applied to them, some of which may have referred to particular sections, while others were mere names of derision.[22]

eum a plerisque nostrorum prophetam putari). But it does not follow from this, as Danz, Heinichen, and Schwegler (S. 223) would have it, that Melito was a Montanist. See Piper's Melito, in the theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1838, i. 86.

[17] Cf. Irenaeus above, not. 14 and 15. The account of Praedestinatus haer. 26: Scripsit contra eos (Montanistas) librum s. Soter Papa urbis is highly improbable, and is perhaps nothing more than a conclusion from Tertullian adv. prax. c. 1, praecessorum ejus auctoritates defendendo.

[18] The Christians of Lyons and Vienne had added to their account of the persecution they endured, a judgment on the controversy with the Montanists, which Eusebius unfortunately omitted, (Euseb. v. 3, 2): *ἐκθέμενοι καὶ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς τελειωθέντων μαρτύρων διαφόρους ἐπιστολάς, ἃς ἐν δεσμοῖς ἔτι ὑπάρχοντες τοῖς ἐπ' Ἀσίας καὶ Φρυγίας ἀδελφοῖς διεχάραξαν οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἐλευθέρῳ, τῷ τότε Ῥωμαίων ἐπισκόπῳ, τῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν εἰρήνης ἕνεκα πρεσβεύοντες.* Comp. the Praefatio of Maranus to the Opp. of the Apologists P. iii. c. 14, § 2 ss.

[19] An instance below, § 53, note 39.

[20] Hieronym. ep. 27, ad Marcellam: Habent primos de Pepusa Phrygiae Patriarchas: secundos, quos appellant Cenonas: atque ita in tertium i.e. paene ultimum locum Episcopi devolvuntur.

[21] The last laws against them proceeded from Justinian, A.D. 530 and 532, see Cod. lib. i. tit. 5, l. 18—21.

[22] Quintilliani, Priscillianistae, *Ἀρτοτυρῖται* (see on this Noesselt de vera aetate scriptt. Tertulliani, § 47), Tascodrugitae (*πασσαλοῤῥυγχῖται*). The following are mere corruptions of words: Tascodrocitae (Cod. Theod. xvi. 5, 10), Ascodrogitae (Philastr. c. 75), Ascodrogi (Theodos. jun. novella iii. in fine), Ascodrutae, Ascodrupitae, (which, however, are enumerated among the Marcosians by Theodoret haer. fab. comp. i. 10), Ascitae (Augustin de haer. 62), cf. Gothofredus ad novellam iii. Theodosii jun. From such corrupted names, however, new heresies have been etymologically deduced.

THIRD CHAPTER.

INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

§ 49.

The internal development of the orthodox church depended in a great degree on its external relations, the persecution of the heathen, and the attacks of heretics. Christian literature had been confined till now solely to didactic and admonitory letters, seven of which in this period also, proceeded from the pious *bishop of Corinth, Dionysius;*[1] but now it developed itself in other directions, particularly in defending Christianity against the heathen, and in combating heretics. It was corrupted, however, by a mass of spurious writings. Those external relations could not be without an influence on the formation of doctrines, since they led of necessity to the exhibition and support of particular dogmas. In like manner, ecclesiastical usages received from them a more definite character. At the same time, it was a circumstance of great importance, that several Platonic philosophers had now come over to Christianity, by means of whom Platonism continued to gain more friends among the Christians. Besides, the Greek language was almost the only ecclesiastical tongue.[2] Although several Latin translations of the Bible were made,[3] yet the writers even of the western church wrote in

[1] Ἐπιστολαί καθολικαί to the churches of Rome, Nicomedia, Gnossus, Athens, Lacedaemon, Gortyna, and in Pontus. Fragments are given by Euseb. ii. 25, iv. 23.

[2] At this period originated the custom of the Roman Church, which continued down to the middle ages, of requiring those who were to be baptised to recite the creed first in Greek then in Latin. Cf. Edm. Martene de antiquis eccl. ritibus ed. 2, T. i. p. 88; A. Gavanti thesaurus sacr. rituum ed G. M. Meratus t. i. p. 42, and the other works quoted in Walchii biblioth. symbol. vetus, p. 57.

[3] Augustin. de doctr. christ. ii. 11. Qui scripturas ex hebraica lingua in graecam verterunt, numerari possunt, latini autem interpretes nullo modo. Ut enim cuivis primis fidei temporibus in manus venit codex Graecus, et aliquantulum facultatis sibi utriusque linguae habere videbatur, ausus est interpretari. c. 16: in ipsis autem interpretationibus Itala caeteris praeferatur; nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiae. L. van Ess Gesch. d. Vulgata, Tübingen 1824. 8.

Greek. But Christian ideas had a freshness of life only in the people who spoke the language of the New Testament. In the west, they merely received what the east produced.

§ 50.

APOLOGIES FOR CHRISTIANITY AGAINST HEATHEN AND JEWS.

J. A. Fabricii delectus argumentorum et syllabus scriptorum, qui veritatem relig. christ. asseruerunt. Hamb. 1725, 4. H. G. Tzschirner's Geschichte der Apologetik. Leipz. Th. 1, 1805, 8. The same author's Fall des Heidenthums i. 202 ff. A list of apologetic works may be found in Danz de Eusebio Caes. p. 93 ss.—The best edition of all the apologists is given by Prudentius Maranus. Paris 1742, fol.

The pressure of circumstances gave rise at this time to various apologies for Christianity, which are supposed in part to have been presented to emperors;[1] the first to Hadrian (126), in Athens, by *Quadratus* and *Aristedes* (*Euseb.* iv. 3; *Hieron. catal.* 19, 20).[2] The first apology of *Justin Martyr* († 166)[3] is addressed to Antoninus Pius (138 or 139), the second and smaller belongs, according to the usual opinion, to Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus (161–166).[4] The other apologetic writings designed for the

[1] First doubted by Bayle s. v. Athenagore. Semler introduction to Baumgarten's Polemik ii. 43. Henke i. 129. In opposition to these doubts, see Tzschirner Fall des Heidenthums i. 233. Semisch Justin d. M. i. 63.

[2] The apology of Quadratus was still extant in the beginning of the seventh century (Photius cod. 162). That Ado (about 860) had the apology of Aristides does not follow from his Martyrolog. ad d. 5, Nov. (cf. J. Dallaei de scriptis, quae sub Dionysii Areop. et Ignatii Antioch. nominibus circumferuntur, p. 90 s.): and the account of de la Guilletière Athènes anciennes et nouvelles, Paris 1676, p. 146, of its being still preserved at that time in the monastery of Medelli at Athens, is as little worthy of credit as all the rest of the narrative of this pretended journey (see on it Spon voyage d'Italie et Dalm. Chateaubriand's travels from Paris to Jerusalem, part i. p. 33.

[3] According to Dr A. Stieren in Illgen's Zeitschr. für d. hist. Theol. 1842, i. 21, the year of Justin's death was 161. On the credibility of the ancient narrative of Justin's death, see Semisch Justin d. M. i. 16.

[4] So according to Pagi, Tillemont, Mosheim, and Semisch. On the other hand, according to Valesius, Longuerue, and Neander (KG. i. ii. 1144), it was also written under Antoninus Pius. F. Chr. Boll, in Illgen's Zeitschrift, 1842, iii. 3, assumes that both apologies made up originally one whole, which may have been written about 150. Apologiam primam ed. J. E. Grabe. Oxon. 1700, alteram H. Hutchin, ib. 1703,

heathen, which are attributed to him, are of more doubtful origin.[5] To Marcus Aurelius, *Athenagoras* addressed his πρεσβεία περὶ Χριστιανῶν;[6] and *Melito*, bishop of Sardis,[7] and *Claudius Apollinaris*, bishop of Hierapolis,[8] their apologies since lost (*Euseb.* iv. 26; *Hieron. cat.* 24, 26). At the same time appeared the apology of *Miltiades* (*Euseb.* v. 17; *Hieron. cat.* 39); of *Theophilus*, bishop of Antioch, in three books to *Autolycus*;[9] and of *Tatian*, the λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας.[10] On the other hand, the epistle to Diognetus is older.[11] Perhaps also *M. Minucius Felix*, a lawyer in Rome,

utramque C. Gu. Thalemann. Lips. 1755. J. W. J. Braunius. Bonnae 1830. 8. In the older editions before Grabe the smaller apology is incorrectly placed first. Comp. Justin d. Märtyrer von C. Semisch. 2 Thle. Breslau 1840—42. 8. J. C. Th. Otto de Justini M. scriptis et doctrina comm. Jenae 1841. 8. S. Justini philosophi et M. opera Rec., prolegomenis, adnotatione ac versione instruxit indicesque adjecit J. C. Th. Otto. 2 tomi. Jenae 1842. 8.

[5] The λόγος παραινετικὸς πρὸς Ἕλληνας was first denied to be Justin Martyr's by Oudinus, lately by Herbig (comm. de scriptis, quae sub nomine Justini phil. et mart. circumferuntur. Vratisl. 1833), Arendt (krit. Untersuchungen uber die Schriften Just. d. M. in the Tübinger theol. Quartalschr., 1834, ii. 256), and Moehler (Patrologie i. 224), but it is defended by Semisch i. 105. The λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας is pronounced unauthentic by most writers, even by Semisch. i. 163. On the fragment περὶ ἀναστάσεως opinions are divided. Herbig l. c. p. 74 endeavours at great length to prove the spuriousness; Semisch i. 146 the genuineness of it. There is also great difference of sentiment respecting the work περὶ μοναρχίας. Herbig p. 69 and Semisch i. 167 regard it as spurious. In the mean time, however, all these works belong to this period.

[6] i. e. supplicatio, not legatio, according to Mosheim de vera aetate apologetici, quam Ath. pro Christ. scripsit, diss. (in dissertt. ad hist. eccl. pertin., vol. i. p. 269 ss.), written in the year 177. ed. J. G. Lindner. Longosal. 1774, ejusd. curae posteriores in Athen. ibid. 1775. 8. Περὶ ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν ed L. A. Rechenberg. Lips. 1685. 8. Th. Adr. Clarisse comm. de Athenagorae vita et scriptis et ejus doctrina de relig. christ. Lugd. Bat. 1819. 8. Guerike de schola Alexandrina i. 21, ii. 6, 50, 97, 403.

[7] Melito, by licentiate F. Piper in the theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1838, i. 54.

[8] The fragments in the Catenae, especially in the Σειρὰ εἰς τὴν Ὀκτάτευχον—ἐπιμελείᾳ Νικηφόρου τοῦ Θεοτόκου, Lips. 1722, 2 voll. fol., attributed to one Apollinaris, deserve a closer examination. The most of them belong to Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea in the fourth century; but many might be referred even to the bishop of Hierapolis. See Schwegler's Montanismus S. 203.

[9] Ed. J. C. Wolf. Hamb. 1724. 8., translated by M. W. F. Thienemann. Leipzig 1834.

[10] Ed. W. Worth. Oxon. 1700. 8. Tatianus d. Apologet, von Dr H. Daniel. Halle 1837. 8.

[11] Formerly attributed falsely to Justin. On the other side, see Til-

who defended Christianity in a dialogue called *Octavius*,[12] belongs to the age of Marcus Aurelius, and is in this view the oldest Latin apologist. On the contrary, the διασυρμὸς τῶν ἔξω φιλοσόφων of *Hermias* must be placed in a later period.[13]

All these defenders aim principally to show the groundlessness of the accusations adduced against Christianity,[14] the reasonableness of it contrasted with the absurdity and immorality of heathenism, and the nothingness of the heathen deities.[15] While

lemont mémoires ii. 371, C. D. a Grossheim de epist. ad Diognetum comm. Lips. 1828. 4to, who fixes the epistle about the year 132; Moehler (Schriften u. Aufsätze i. 19. Patrologie i. 164), who places it in the time of Trajan; Semisch (Justin d. M. i. 172), who puts it in the time of Justin. It has been published with an introduction and remarks by Lic. G. Böhl in Opuscula Patram selecta. Berol. 1826. p. i. p. 109 ss.

[12] In the three only known MSS., and in the older editions, it appears as the eighth book of Arnobius (lib. octavus, a misunderstanding of the title Octavius). It has been very frequently published, among other forms cum integris Woweri, Elmenhorstii, Heraldi et Rigaltii notis, aliorumque hinc inde collectis, ex rec. Jac. Gronovii. Accedunt Cyprianus de idol. van. et Jul. Firm. Maternus. Lugd. Bat. 1709. 8. J. G. Lindner. Longosalissae 1760, ed ii. emend. 1773. 8., translated with an introduction and remarks by J. G. Russwurm, Hamburg 1824. 4., newly published, explained and translated by Dr J. H. B. Lubkert, Leipzig 1836. 8., ad fidem codd. regii et Bruxell. rec. Ed. d. Muralto. Turici 1836. 8. The earlier more prevailing opinion that Minucius belongs to the interval between Tertullian and Cyprian, 220—230, rested particularly on the testimony of Jerome, who Catal. cap. 53 says: Tertullianus presbyter nunc demum primus post Victorem et Apollonium Latinorum ponitur; and first mentions Minucius in cap. 58. On the other hand, Blondell (de l'Eucharistie, p. 119), Dallaeus (against whom see Bayle's dictionn. s. v. Fronton), J. D. ab Hoven (in Lindner's second edition, p. 261), Oelrichs (de scriptt. eccl. lat., p. 24) place him, from internal grounds, and because, cap. 9, Fronto (see § 40, note 2) is mentioned as still living, in the age of Marcus Aurelius. This view has been lately adopted by Kestner (Agape S. 356), H. Meirer (comm. de Minucio Felice, Turici 1824. 8.), Russwurm, and v. Muralt l. c., and even Tzschirner (Fall des Heidenthums i. 219), who had formerly defended the old opinion in the Geschichte der Apologetik i. 279.

[13] ed. Worth (annexed to his Tatian), J. Ch. Dommerich, Hal. 1764. 8., Gu. F. Menzel, Lugd. Bat. 1840. 8. According to Menzel, the work belongs to the fifth century.

[14] Ch. F. Eisenlohr argumenta ab apologetis saec. ii. ad confirmandam rel. christ. veritatem usurpata. Tubing. 1797. 4. (recus in Pottii sylloge comm. theologg., vol. ii. p. 114 ss.) Tzschirner's Fall des Heidenth. i. 237 ff. F. Wurm in Klaiber's Studien der evangel. Geistlichkeit Wirtemberg's i. ii. 1. Semisch Justin d. M. ii. 56.

[15] Here an important preparation had been already made for them by the heathen philosophers, especially by the view that had originated

they refer to the fact that Christianity agrees with the wisest philosophers, they represent the latter again as having drawn their wisdom from the Old Testament. In proving the divine origin of Christianity, they attach special value to the predictions of the Old Testament, the miracles of Jesus and the apostles, the miraculous powers continuing among Christians,[16] the rapid spread of Christianity, and the steadfastness of its followers in times of persecution. They demand, in fine, the same protection for Christians, which other philosophical sects enjoyed.

In defence of Christianity against Judaism, there appeared at this period two dialogues; under Hadrian the ἀντιλογία Παπίσκου καὶ Ἰάσονος, which was afterwards, but certainly without reason, ascribed to *Aristo of Pella*;[17] and διάλογος πρὸς Τρύφωνα Ἰουδαῖον, of *Justin Martyr*.[18]

with Euhemerus, that the deities were dead men. See above § 13, note 5. Cf. Athenagoras leg., p. 35. Theoph. ad Autol., p. 75, 80. Minucius Felix Oct., c. 21, appeals expressly to Euhemerus.

[16] Tholuck on the miracles of the Catholic Church in his verm. Schriften i. 28.

[17] This ἀντιλογία or διάλεξις, cited so early as by Celsus (Orig. c. Cels. iv. p. 199), is lost, and even of the Latin translation of one Celsus the Praef. ad Vigilium (in opp. Cypriani) is alone extant. Maximus († 662) comm. ad Dionys. Areop. de myst. theol., c. 1, is the first who names Ariston as the author, but adds that Clement of Alex. hypotyposeon, lib. vi., ascribes this dialogue to Luke. On the other hand, Hieron. in quaest. in Genes says: In principio fecit Deus coelum et terram. Plerique existimant, sicut in altercatione quoque Iasonis et Papisci scriptum est—in Hebraeo haberi: in filio fecit Deus coelum et terram. Quod falsum esse ipsius rei veritas comprobat. A Hebrew Jewish-Christian like Aristo could never have written that. The Chron. paschale ad Olymp. 228, ann. 2, says that Ἀπελλῆς and Ἀρίστων (probably ὁ Πελλαῖος Ἀρίστων) handed over an apology to Hadrian. Since this is not found, it seems that some conjectured they discovered it in the dialogue in question.

[18] Ed. Sam. Jebb. Lond. 1719. 8. The doubts of its authenticity raised by C. G. Koch (Justini M. cum Tryph. Jud. dial.—suppositionis convictus. Kilon. 1700. 8. The controversial writings on the subject, see in Walchii bibl. patrist., p. 216), Wetstein, Semler (Wetst. prolegg. in N. T. ed. Semler, p. 174), and S. G. Lange (Gesch. d. Dogmen d. christl. Kirche i. 137), have been answered by G. Münscher an dialogus cum Tryphone Justino M. recte adscribatur. Marb. 1799. 4. (also in commentatt. theoll. edd. Rosenmüller, Fuldner et Maurer i. ii. 184), and Semisch Justin d. M. i. 75.

§ 51.

COMBATING OF HERETICS—CATHOLIC CHURCH—CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The writings of the earlier opponents of heretics, the work of *Justin Martyr* against all heresies;[1] the books of *Agrippa Castor* (about 135), who wrote against Basilides; of *Justin Martyr*, *Theophilus* of *Antioch*, *Rhodon*, *Philip* bishop of Gortyna, and of *Modestus*, who all wrote against Marcion; of *Miltiades*, *Claudius Apollinaris*, *Serapion*, bishop of Antioch, and *Apollonius*, who all wrote against the Montanists, have been lost, except a few fragments. On the other hand, we still possess the work of *Irenaeus* (bishop of Lyons, 177—202), ἔλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως in 5 books, but for the most part merely in an old Latin translation.[2]

The discordant opinions of the philosophical schools (αἱρέσεις), which were to have been removed by the one, certain, Christian truth, had again appeared within the province of Christianity at this period, in the different parties. The ecclesiastical idea of αἵρεσις attached itself to them chiefly from the characteristic of separation from the unity implied in the true church, and of insecure subjective presumption;[3] but since Christian truth appeared not

[1] Σύνταγμα κατὰ πασῶν τῶν γεγενημένων αἱρέσεων cited by himself, Apol. i. c. 26.

[2] Ed. J. E. Grabe. Oxon. 1702. fol. Renatus Massuet. Paris 1710. fol. Lib. iii. capita 1—4, in graecum sermonem restituta, criticisque annotationibus illustrata per H. Gu. J. Thiersch in the theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1842. ii. 512. A. Stieren de Irenaei adv. haer. operis fontibus, indole, doctrina, et dignitate. Gottingae 1836. 4. In favour of the authenticity, in regard to which doubts were raised by Semler (especially in the dissert. on Tertull. in his edition of Tertullian, vol. v. p. 261, 300 ss.), see Chr. G. F. Walch de αὐθεντίᾳ librorum Iren. adv. haer. in nov. commentariis soc. scient. Gotting. T. v. p. 1. Respecting the fragments of Irenaeus found by Pfaff in the Turin Library (S. Irenaei fragmenta anecdota ed. Chr. M. Pfaff, Hagae Com. 1715. 8., reprinted in his syntagma dissertt. theoll. Stuttgard. 1720. 8. p. 573), whose authenticity was doubted, chiefly from a Catholic bias, by Scip. Maffei, see Rothe's Anfänge d. christl. Kirche i. 361.

[3] Irenaeus v. 20, 2: Tales sunt omnes haeretici—semper quaerentes et nunquam verum invenientes. Tertullianus de praescr. 6: haereses dictae graeca voce ex interpretatione electionis, qua quis, sive ad instituendas, sive ad suscipiendas eas utitur. Nobis vero nihil ex nostro ar-

likely to be mistaken without blame attaching to the individuals, it was generally believed that the sources of the heresies must be looked for in nothing else than self-will, pride, ambition, desire of rule, and unamiableness.[4] To the opposition presented to unbelievers, with which alone the church had been contented till the present time,[5] there was now added the other opposition directed against heretics. By this means the idea of *the church* being farther developed, there arose the expression ἐκκλησία καθολική,[6] *i. e. the only church*,[7] out of which there is no salvation,[8] which is destined to become universal, and has already given practical proof of this destination.[9]

bitrio inducere licet, sed nec eligere quod aliquis de arbitrio suo induxerit. Apostolos Domini habemus auctores, qui nec ipsi quidquam ex suo arbitrio, quod inducerent, elegerunt, sed acceptam a Christo disciplinam fideliter nationibus adsignaverunt. Comp. Rothe's Anf. d. christl. Kirche i. 563.

[4] Irenaeus iii. 3, 2, confundimus omnes eos, qui quoquo modo, vel per sibiplacentiam vel vanam gloriam, vel per caecitatem et malam sententiam praeterquam oportet colligunt. iv. 33, 7, Ἀνακρινεῖ δὲ τοὺς τὰ σχίσματα ἐργαζομένους, κενοὺς ὄντας τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγάπης, καὶ τὸ ἴδιον λυσιτελὲς σκοποῦντας, ἀλλὰ μὴ τὴν ἕνωσιν τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Clemens Alex. Strom. vii. p. 887, αἱ φίλαυται καὶ φιλόδοξοι αἱρέσεις.

[5] See above § 30.

[6] The name first appears in Ignatii epist. ad Smyrn. c. 8, and in the Epist. Eccl. Smyrn. de martyr. Polycarpi ap Eusebius iv. c. 15, § 1. Tertull. de praescr. haeret. c. 20: (Apostoli) ecclesias apud unamquamque civitatem condiderunt, a quibus traducem fidei et semina doctrinae caeterae exinde ecclesiae mutuatae sunt, et quotidie mutuantur, ut ecclesiae fiant. Ac per hoc et ipsae apostolicae deputantur, ut soboles apostolicarum ecclesiarum. Omne genus ad originem suam censeatur necesse est: itaque tot ac tantae ecclesiae una est, illa ab Apostolis prima, ex qua omnes. Sic omnes prima, et omnes apostolicae, dum una; omnes probant unitatem. The words cannôt refer to a formal founding of the Catholic Church, as is assumed by J. E. Ch. Schmidt in his Bibliothek fur Krit. u. Exegese ii. 1. The idea first arose, and it afterwards gave expression to itself by degrees, in the constitution and or linances of the church. Comp. Münschers Dogmengeschichte ii. 379. Twesten's Dogmatik i. 109. Rothe's Anf. d. christl. Kirche i. 555.

[7] In opposition to the sects which designed to form churches also, but which were only schools, διατριβαί (Clem. Alex. strom. vii. p. 889), ἀνθρώπιναι συνηλύσεις (l. c. p. 898).

[8] Irenaeus iv. 26, 2. Haeretici alienum ignem afferentes ad altare Dei, i.e. alienas doctrinas, a coelesti igne comburentur, quemadmodum Nadab et Abiud. iv. 33, 7. Tertull. de baptismo c. 8. Ecclesia est arca figurata (cf. 1 Petr. iii. 20, 21).

[9] Irenaeus i. 10, 1. Ἡ Ἐκκλησία καθ' ὅλης οἰκουμένης ἕως περάτων τῆς γῆς διεσπαρμένη. Cf. i. 10, 2, iii. 11, 8, iv. 36, 2, v. 20, 1.

The writers against heresies certainly went into the peculiar doctrines of the heretics, for the purpose of refuting them; but they particularly combated their pretensions in alleging that their doctrine was the genuine doctrine of Christ and the apostles, by proving, from the agreement of the apostolic churches, that the doctrine of the apostles had been preserved without alteration in the catholic church.[10] The common interest which

[10] Tertullian. de praescr. haer. c. 21. Quid autem (Apostoli) praedicaverint, id est, quid illis Christus revelaverit: et hic praescribam, non aliter probari debere, nisi per easdem ecclesias, quas ipsi Apostoli condiderunt, ipsi eis praedicando, tam viva (quod ajunt) voce, quam per epistolas postea. Si haec ita sunt, constat proinde omnem doctrinam, quae cum illis ecclesiis apostolicis, matricibus et originalibus fidei conspiret, veritati deputandam. C. 36: Percurre ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsae adhuc cathedrae Apostolorum suis locis praesident, apud quas authenticae literae eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem et repraesentantes faciem uniuscujusque! Proxima est tibi Achaja? habes Corinthum. Si non longe es a Macedonia, habes Philippos, habes Thessalonicenses. Si potes in Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiae adjaces, habes Roman, unde nobis quoque auctoritas praesto est. Ista quam Felix ecclesia, cui totam doctrinam Apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt, ubi Petrus passioni dominicae adaequatur, ubi Paulus Johannis exitu coronatur, ubi Apostolus Johannes, posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur. Videamus quid dixerit, quid cum Africanis quoque ecclesiis contesserarit, &c. (Comp. Neander's Antignosticus S. 313 ff.) But in the west the Roman was the only apostolic church. Hence they naturally appealed to it there chiefly, Iren. iii. 3. Traditionem itaque Apostolorum in toto mundo manifestatam, in omni ecclesia adest perspicere omnibus, qui vera velint videre, et habemus annumerare eos, qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt Episcopi in ecclesiis et successores eorum usque ad nos, qui nihil tale docuerunt.—Sed quoniam valde longum est, in hoc tali volumine omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones; maximae et antiquissimae et omnibus cognitae a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis, Petro et Paulo, Romae fundatae et constitutae ecclesiae eam, quam habet ab Apostolis, traditionem et annunciatam hominibus fidem, per successiones Episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos, indicantes confundimus omnes eos, qui quoquo modo—praeterquam oportet colligunt. Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potentiorem (so all MSS., Massuet was the first that altered it into potiorem) principalitatem necesse est omnen convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea, quae est ab Apostolis, traditio. Irenaeus wishes to prove that the doctrine of the Catholic Church is apostolic, preserved by the successors of the bishops ordained by the apostles. Since it is too tedious to point out this connection of the apostles with all churches, he wishes to limit his proof to the Church of Rome alone, and finally to represent the doctrine of the Roman Church as necessarily agreeing with that of the whole remaining church. Necesse est (ἀνάγκη) must

was felt against heretics, and the feeling of oneness, strengthened by the idea of *a catholic church*, led to a closer union, of which the apostolic churches were regarded as the centre, though without the existence of an external subordination among them.

As the heretics appealed to apostolic traditions, and even used pretended apostolic writings in justification of their sentiments, the attention of catholic Christians was by this means directed to the genuine writings of the apostles scattered among

not be confounded with oportet (δεῖ); the former expresses a natural necessity, the latter an obligation, duty. Potentior is ἱκανώτερος (cf. iii. 3, 3: potentissimas literas, ἱκανωτάτην γραφήν), principalitas probably πρωτεία (iv. 38, 3: πρωτεύει μὲν ἐν πᾶσιν ὁ Θεός, principalitatem quidem habebit in omnibus Deus). Accordingly the Greek text may have been: πρὸς ταύτην γάρ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν διὰ τὴν ἱκανωτέραν πρωτείαν ἀνάγκη πᾶσαν συμβαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, τουτέστι τοὺς πανταχόθεν πιστούς, ἐν ᾗ ἀεί τοῖς πανταχόθεν συντετήρηται ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων παράδοσις. "For with this church must the whole church, i.e. the believers of every place, agree, of course, on account of its more important pre-eminence." A pre-eminence belonged to all apostolic churches; to the Roman Church a more important pre-eminence, on account of its greatness, and its having been founded by two most distinguished apostles. In the rest of the sentence, I conjecture that the Latin translator was mistaken. Supposing the Greek text to have stood as above, the translator took the words τοῖς πανταχόθεν for ὑπὸ τῶν πάντ. which was certainly grammatically correct; "in which the apostolic tradition was always preserved by believers from all places," referring to the many foreigners who constantly belonged to the Roman community, and who afforded a warrant for the uninterrupted agreement of the Roman tradition with that of the rest of the church. But Irenaeus meant to say: "in which the apostolic tradition has been always preserved in correspondence with the believers of all places." Hence he adduces, in what follows, Clement's epistle to the Corinthians, and Polycarp's abode at Rome, as proofs of this uninterrupted correspondence. Many other explanations may be seen in Grabe and Massuet on the passage. Paulus in Sophronizon Heft 3. 1819. S. 141 ff. On the other side, Th. Katerkamp uber den Primat d. Apost. Petrus u. s. Nachfolger. Münster 1820. S. 30 ff. Griesbach de potentiore Eccl. Rom. principalitate comm. Jen. 1778. (reprinted in his Opuscula Academ. ed. Gabler, vol. ii. p. 136 ss.) H. W. J. Thiersch in the Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1842, ii. 525. L. Wolff in Rudelbach's and Guerike's Zeitschrift für d. luther. Kirche, 1842, iv. 7. Thiersch reads πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν, and refers to it the ἐν ᾗ in the sense: unaquaeque alia ecclesia idem testabitur de traditione Apostolorum, dummodo in ea a fidelibus, cujusvis sint loci, pure conservata sit tradita ab Apostolis veritas. On the contrary, Neander KG. i. i. 349 says that the expression, qui undique sunt fideles, is not synonymous with omnis ecclesia, if the latter mean "every single church," but only if it mean "every church," i.e. all churches: and in the single churches the tradition was not preserved ab iis qui sunt undique.

them. The apostolic epistles had always been read in the places to which they were addressed, and in the neighbouring congregations; but there was no universally received collection of the evangelical narratives, and the existing ones (comprehending, besides our canonical gospels, also *the gospel of the Hebrews*, that *of the Egyptians*, &c.) served in their spheres only for private use. After the churches had now come into closer connection, they communicated to one another, in their common interest against heretics, the genuine apostolic writings; and thus the canon began to be formed, in the first half of the second century, in two parts (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον or τὸ εὐαγγελικόν, and ὁ Ἀπόστολος or τὸ Ἀποστολικόν), although in the different congregations there continued to be other writings, which were valued almost, if not altogether, as much as those which were universally received (ὁμολογούμενα, ἐνδιάθηκα).[11]

Instigated by the bold speculation of the Gnostics, which sought to lay an entirely foreign basis under Christianity, the catholic Christians began to establish as the unalterable *regula fidei*,[12] that complex notion of doctrine which could be shown, as well in the consciousness of all Christian communities, as also in the apostolic writings, to be an essential basis of Christianity, and which must remain untouched by, and be necessarily laid at the foundation of, every speculation. Accordingly, even the originally simple conditions of the baptismal confession (πίστις, σύμβολον)[13] were secured by additions

[11] Compare my essay über die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der schriftl. Evangelien. Leipz. 1818. S. 142 ff. 179 ff. 190 ff.

[12] ὁ κανὼν ἐκκλησιαστικός Clemens Alex. strom. vi. p. 803. ὁ κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας Iren. i. 1 in fine. This rule of faith, therefore, as it is found, for example, in Irenaeus i. 10, 1, was not a formula handed down to the apostles (cf. Tertull. de praescr. c. 13: Haec regula a Christo, ut probabitur, instituta, particularly c. 21: omnis doctrina, quam ecclesiae ab Apostolis, Apostoli a Christo, Christus a Deo accepit, c. 37, regula, quam ecclesia ab apostolis, apostoli a Christo, Christus a Deo tradidit), and was not placed above the interpretation of Scripture (for according to Tertullian de corona militis c. 3, it was a Catholic fundamental principle, etiam in traditionis obtentu exigenda est auctoritas scripta), as was asserted, after Lessing's example, by Delbrück Philip Melancthon der Glaubenslehrer. Bonn 1826. S. 17 ff. 145 ff. Comp. on the authority of holy scripture, and its relation to the rule of faith, three theological epistles to Herr Prof. Delbrück by Sack, Nitzsch, and Lücke. Bonn 1827.

[13] Maximus Turinensis (about 430) homil. in Symb. p. 239: Symbolum tessera est et signaculum, quo inter fideles perfidosque secernitur. These additions are referred to by Tertull. de corona mil. c. 3: ter mer-

against misunderstandings and perversions; but as the different wants of the church required this or the other doctrine to be made more obvious, or to be emphatically exhibited, so the form of the baptismal confession became longer or shorter.[14]

§ 52.

DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINES—SPURIOUS WRITINGS.

A speculative treatment of Christian doctrine was generally indispensable, if Christianity should be accessible to the philosophical culture of the times, and was rendered unavoidable by the measures of the Gnostics. It could only proceed from Platonism, which of all philosophical systems stood the nearest to Christianity.[1] While many Platonic philosophers were brought over to Christianity by this internal relation, they received the latter as the most perfect philosophy,[2] and retained, with their philosophical mantle,[3] their philosophical turn of mind also. They set out with this principle, both that the Logos has constantly communicated to men the seeds of truth,[4] and that the

gitamur, amplius aliquid respondentes, quam Dominus in Evangelio determinavit.

[14] Cf. Ch. G. F. Walchii biblioth. symbolica vetus. Lemgov. 1770. 8. Dr Aug. Hahn Bibliothek d. Symbole u. Glaubensregeln d. apostolisch-katholischen Kirche. Breslau 1842. 8. P. Kingii hist. symboli apostolici ex angl. serm. in latinum translata (by Olearius). Basil. 1750. 8. J. R. Kiesling hist. de usu symbolorum. Lips. 1753. 8.

[1] (Stäudlin) de philosophiae Platonicae cum doctrina religionis judaica et christiana cognatione (A Göttingen Whitsuntide programm 1819. 4.) D. C. Ackermann das Christliche im Plato u. in d. platon. Philosophie. Hamburg 1835. D. F. Chr. Baur das Christliche des Platonismus, od. Sokrates u. Christus, in the Tübinger Zeitschr. f. Theologie 1837. Heft 3.

[2] Comp. the remarkable history of Justin Martyr's conversion in his dial. c. Tryph. c. 3 ss: which he, c. 8, concludes with the words, *ταύτην μόνην εὕρισκον φιλοσοφίαν ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ σύμφορον. Οὕτως δὴ καὶ διὰ ταῦτα φιλόσοφος ἐγώ.* Thus Christianity is designated by Melito ap. Euseb. iv. 26, 4, as *ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς φιλοσοφία.* Keilii Opusc. ii. 463.

[3] *τρίβων, τριβώνιον,* pallium. C. G. F. Walchii antiquitates pallii philosophici vett. Christian. Jen. 1746. 8. Semisch Justin d. M. i. 23.

[4] Justin M. apol. ii. c. 13. *οὐκ ἀλλότριά ἐστι τὰ Πλάτωνος διδάγματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἔστι πάντη ὅμοια, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων, Στωϊκῶν τε, καὶ ποιητῶν, καὶ συγγραφέων· ἕκαστος γάρ τις ἀπὸ μέρους τοῦ σπερματι-*

truth taught by Plato was derived from Moses and the prophets.[5] The arbitrary mode of interpretation then current furnished them with the means of proving their views even from numerous passages of the Old Testament, which they could use, indeed, only in the Septuagint version.[6] Thus, then, they overvalued even the actual agreement of Plato with Christianity,[7] and believed that they found many a Platonic idea in the latter, which in reality they themselves had first introduced into it.[8] The Christian philosophers of this time with which we are acquainted are *Aristides, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Tatian, Pantaenus*

κοῦ θείου λόγου τὸ συγγενὲς ὀρῶν καλῶς ἐφθέγξατο.—ὅσα οὖν παρὰ πᾶσι καλῶς εἴρηται, ἡμῶν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἐστί. According to c. 10, Christ was apprehended καὶ ὑπὸ Σωκράτους ἀπὸ μέρους: λόγος γὰρ ἦν καὶ ἔστιν ὁ ἐν παντὶ ὤν.

[5] So the Jews had already asserted, Josephus contra Apion ii. 8; and Aristobulus apud Clemens Alex. strom. i. p. 410, according to whom Plato is said to have employed even the Old Testament in an ancient version. The heathen philosopher Numenius (l. c.) goes so far as to say: τί ἐστι Πλάτων, ἢ Μωσῆς ἀττικίζων. The fathers derived all that was true and good in the Greek poets and philosophers from Moses and the prophets, Justin apolog. i. 44, ii. 13. Coh. ad Graecos c. 14. Theoph. ad Autol. ii. 37: Because they found most truth in Plato, they represented him especially as drawing from this source. Hence he is called in Clemens Alex. paed. ii. p. 224 ὁ ἐκ Μωσέως φιλόσοφος, strom. i. p. 321, ὁ ἐξ Ἑβραίων φιλόσοφος. Cf. H. N. Clausen Apologetae Eccl. christ. antetheodosiani Platonis ejusque philosophiae arbitri. Havn. 1817. 8. p. 187 ss. Clausen himself attributes to Plato (p. 196) some knowledge of the law and of the doctrine of the Hebrews.

[6] Comp. Justini coh. ad Graecos c. 20 ss. According to c. 29, Plato is said to have borrowed his doctrine of ideas from the passages Exod. xxv. 9, 40; xxvi. 30, incorrectly understood; and according to c. 31, to have imitated Ezek. x. 18 in the winged chariot of Zeus, &c. See Clausen l. c. p. 191.

[7] Justin finds in him the doctrine of the Son and Spirit; Clemens Alex. strom. v. p. 710, the whole Christian Trinity. Clausen l. c. p. 84.

[8] The Platonism of the fathers was perceived even by Petavius dogm. theol. T. ii. lib. i. c. 3. The dogma of the Trinity was derived from it by (Souverain) le Platonisme devoilé, ou Essai touchant le verbe Platonicien. Cologne (Amsterdam) 1700 (translated by Löffler: Versuch über d. Platonismus d. KV. Züllichau 1782. 2te Aufl. 1792. 8.), and Jo. Clericus epist. crit. et eccles. (artis criticae vol. iii. Amst. 1712), especially ep. vii. and viii. On the other side, the matter was exaggerated by the Jesuit Baltus défense des saints pères, accusés de Platonisme. Paris 1711. 4. Keil de doctoribus veteris ecclesiae, culpa corruptae per platonicas sententias theologiae liberandis, comm. xxii. in ej. opusc., T. ii., Lips. 1821, has copiously given the literature of the subject.

(§ 39), and *Maximus* (about 196).[9] The questions with which they were chiefly occupied were the same as those the Gnostics set out with, respecting the origin of evil, and its overthrow by Christ, but especially regarding the divine in Christ.[10] They found the latter designated by John as the λόγος, and in the development of this idea took Philo for their guide; while, like him, they thought the Logos was met with everywhere in the Old Testament.[11] Most difficult were the questions respecting the essence of the Logos in relation to the Father, and his agency in relation to that of the Holy Spirit. With regard to the former point, there were several who did not assume a personal distinction of the Logos from the Father.[12] But the view was more

[9] Fragments of his work περὶ τῆς ὕλης are preserved in Euseb. praep. ev. vii. 22.

[10] Ch. D. A. Martini Vers. einer pragm. Gesch. des Dogma v. d. Gottheit Christi in den vier ersten Jahrh. Th. 1. Rostock 1800. 8. Dr F. Chr. Baur's die christl. Lehre v. d. Dreieinigk. u. Menschwerdung Gottes (3 Th. Tübingen 1841—43. 8.) i. 163. G. A. Meier's die Lehre v. d. Trinität in ihrer hist. Entwickelung (Hamburg u. Gotha 1844) i. 53.

[11] So particularly Proverbs viii. 22 ss., but also Psal. xxxiii. 6; xlv. 1; civ. 24. The doctrine that God created the world by the Logos was also naturally sought for in the Mosaic account of creation, where it was found. Gen. i. 1 ἐν ἀρχῇ is equivalent to διὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς, and ἀρχή is, according to Proverbs viii. 22, ἡ σοφία or ὁ λόγος. Theophil. ad Autol. ii. 10, 13. Tatian. apol. c. 7. Tertull. adv. Hermog. c. 20. This explanation was repeated in later times by Origenes hom. 1, in Gen., Basilius hom. 1, in Hexaëmeron, Augustinus de Genesi lib. i. Others believed that they should venture to presuppose the existence of that doctrine as still more obviously contained in the Hebrew original, which they did not know. According to the Altercatio Iasonis et Papisci, the original expressed this idea, in filio fecit Deus coelum et terram (see above § 50, note 17); or as others believed (Tertull. adv. Praxeam c. 5), in principio Deus fecit sibi filium.

[12] Justini dial. c. Tryph. c. 128: γινώσκω τινὰς—λέγειν,—ἄτμητον καὶ ἀχώριστον τοῦ πατρὸς ταύτην τὴν δύναμιν [τὸν λόγον] ὑπάρχειν, ὅπερ τρόπον τὸ τοῦ ἡλίου φασὶ φῶς ἐπὶ γῆς εἶναι ἄτμητον καὶ ἀχώριστον ὄντος τοῦ ἡλίου ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ· καὶ ὅταν δύσῃ, συναποφέρεται τὸ φῶς· οὕτως ὁ πατὴρ, ὅταν βούληται, λέγουσι, δύναμιν αὐτοῦ προπηδᾷν ποιεῖ· καὶ ὅταν βούληται, πάλιν ἀναστέλλει εἰς ἑαυτόν. Κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους ποιεῖν αὐτὸν διὸάσκουσιν. Athenagoras represents the Logos in the very same way as Philo to be the manifest God, not personally distinct from the concealed deity. Legat. c. 9: Ἔστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν ἰδέᾳ καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ· πρὸς αὐτοῦ [leg. αὐτὸν] γὰρ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ πάντα ἐγένετο· ἑνὸς ὄντος τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, ὄντος δὲ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐν πατρὶ, καὶ πατρὸς ἐν υἱῷ, ἑνότητι καὶ δυνάμει πνεύματος· νοῦς καὶ λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. Εἰ δὲ δι' ὑπερβολὴν συνέσεως σκοπεῖν ὑμῖν ἔπεισιν, ὁ παῖς τί βούλεται, ἐρῶ διὰ βραχέων, πρῶτον γέννημα εἶναι τῷ πατρὶ, οὐχ ὡς γενόμενον (ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ὁ θεὸς, νοῦς,

generally adopted, that he was a divine person, less than the Father, and produced out of his essence according to the will of the latter.[13] Agreeably to both views, the Logos was the God working all in the finite, so that no room appeared to be left for the agency of the Holy Spirit. Accordingly, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit still remained entirely undeveloped.[14] These specu-

ἀΐδιος ὤν, εἶχεν αὐτὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν λόγον, ἀϊδίως λογικὸς ὤν), ἀλλ' ὡς, τῶν ὑλικῶν ξυμπάντων ἀποίου φύσεως καὶ γῆς ὀχείας [leg. ἀχρείας] ὑποκειμένων δίκην, μεμιγμένων τῶν παχυμερεστέρων πρὸς τὰ κουφότερα ἐπ' αὐτοις, ἰδέα καὶ ἐνέργεια εἶναι προελθών. Συνᾴδει δὲ τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα· Κύριος γάρ, φησιν, ἔκτισέ με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ (Proverbs viii. 22)· καί τοι καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ ἐνεργοῦν τοῖς ἐκφωνοῦσι προφητικῶς ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἀπόῤῥοιαν εἶναι φαμὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀπορρέον καὶ ἐπαναφερόμενον, ὡς ἀκτῖνα ἡλίου. Comp. Münscher's Dogmengesch. i. 407. Martini l. c. S. 54. Clarisse comm. de Athenagora p. 98. Others supposed that the divine in Christ was exactly one with the Father: Scriptor xii. testam. Patriarch: Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς μέγας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ φαινόμενος ἐπὶ γῆς ὡς ἄνθρωπος (Sym. 6). τὸ πάθος τοῦ Ὑψίστου (Lev. 4). Cf. Nitzsch de testam. xii. Patriarch. p. 29. Epiphanius haer. lxii. c. 2, respecting the Evangelium Aegyptiorum: ἐν αὐτῷ πολλὰ τοιαῦτα ὡς ἐν παραβύστῳ μυστηριωδῶς ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἀναφέρεται, ὡς αὐτοῦ δηλοῦντος τοῖς μαθηταῖς, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι Πατέρα, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι Υἱόν, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, comp. Neander's Antignosticus, S. 467 ff. According to Baur (Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit i. 173) even Irenaeus had no definite ideas of the Son as personally distinct from the Father. On the other side see Licentiate L. Duncker's des h. Irenaeus Christologie. Göttingen 1843. 8. S. 32.

[13] Semisch Justin d. M. ii. 277. Tertull. adv. Praxeam c. 8 calls this emanation προβολὴν veritatis in opposition to the false προβολαῖς of the Gnostics. The Montanists believed this latter theory confirmed by the revelation of the Paraclete, l. c. c. ii. 8, 13. The Alogi, on the contrary, rejected the doctrine of the Logos. Epiphan. haer. li. L. Lange's Gesch. u. Lehrbegriff d. Unitarier vor der nicänischen Synode. Leipz. 1831. S. 156.

[14] Accordingly, the fathers of this period represent the prophets to be inspired sometimes by the Logos, sometimes by the Holy Spirit, and call both the Logos and the Holy Spirit σοφίαν, &c. Semisch Justin. d. M. ii. 305, 311. Note.—Theophilus ad. Autol. ii. 23, gives the members of the Divine triad thus: Θεὸς, ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡ σοφία αὐτοῦ, and says, ii. 14: Ἔχων οὖν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ λόγον ἐνδιάθετον ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις σπλάγχνοις, ἐγέννησεν αὐτὸν μετὰ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σοφίας ἐξερευξάμενος πρὸ τῶν ὅλων. Τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ἔσχεν ὑπουργὸν τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγενημένων καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα πεποίηκεν.—Οὗτος οὖν ὢν πνεῦμα Θεοῦ, καὶ ἀρχὴ, καὶ σοφία, καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου κατήρχετο εἰς τοὺς προφήτας, καὶ δι' αὐτῶν ἐλάλει τὰ περὶ τῆς ποιήσεως τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἁπάντων. οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν οἱ προφῆται, ὅτε ὁ κόσμος ἐγίνετο, ἀλλὰ ἡ σοφία ἡ ἐν αὐτῷ οὖσα ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ὁ λόγος ὁ ἅγιος αὐτοῦ ὁ ἀεὶ συμπαρὼν αὐτῷ. Here the Holy Spirit is the immanent wisdom of God, but the Logos the revealed God, who emanated from the Father.

lations, whose object was to fathom the depths of the Godhead, might certainly at first wound the feelings of many, and Irenaeus openly expresses his disapprobation of the inconsiderate curiosity they manifest;[15] but, on the other hand, ecclesiastical orthodoxy could still endure diversities in doctrine and customs, which did not injure the religious basis of Christianity.[16]

Notwithstanding this philosophical tendency, and although in other respects the Pauline mode of surveying Christianity predominated, yet *the millennarianism* of the Jewish Christians,[17] presenting a sensuous counterpoise to the external pressure of persecution, which had been announced in so many apocalyptic writings,[18] and for which the reputation of John (Apoc. xx. 4—6; xxi.) and his peculiar followers, afforded a warrant—this millennarianism became the general belief of the time, and met with almost no other opposition than that given by the gnostics,[19]

[15] Irenaeus adv. haer. ii. 28, 6: Si quis itaque nobis dixerit: quomodo ergo Filius prolatus a Patre est? dicimus ei, quia prolationem istam, sive generationem, sive nuncupationem, sive adapertionem, aut quolibet quis nomine vocaverit generationem ejus inenarrabilem existentem, nemo novit, non Valentinus—neque Angeli—nisi solus qui generavit Pater, et qui natus est filius. Inenarrabilis itaque generatio ejus cum sit, quicunque nituntur generationes et prolationes enarrare, non sunt compotes sui, ea quae inenarrabilia sunt, enarrare promittentes. Quoniam enim ex cogitatione et sensu verbum emittitur, hoc utique omnes sciunt homines: non ergo magnum quid invenerunt, qui emissiones excogitaverunt, neque absconditum mysterium, si id quod ab omnibus intelligitur, transtulerunt in unigenitum Dei Verbum: et quem inenarrabilem et innominabilem vocant, hunc, quasi ipsi obstetricaverint, primae generationis ejus prolationem et generationem enunciant, adsimilantes eum hominum verbo emissionis (λόγῳ προφορικῷ). Comp. Duncker's des h. Iren. Christologie, S. 36.

[16] This doctrinal latitudinarianism is shown in the fact of the Nazarene Hegesippus, being recognised as orthodox in the churches of Corinth and Rome, these churches agreeing with his orthodoxy. See above § 43, note 4. The same latitudinarianism may be seen in Justin's declaration respecting those who denied the personality of the Logos (above not. 12), in the estimation in which the Shepherd of Hermas was held. (See § 35, not. 4, § 36 not. 3.)

[17] (H. Corodi's) krit. Geschichte des Chiliasmus, 3 Bde, Zürich 1781—83, 8.

[18] See above § 31.

[19] To the question of Trypho, whether Justin really believes in a millennial reign, Justin replies: Dial. cum Tryph. c. 80, ὡμολόγησά σοι καὶ πρότερον, ὅτι ἐγὼ μὲν καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ ταῦτα φρονοῦμεν, ὡς καὶ πάντως ἐπίστασθε (you Jews), τοῦτο γενησόμενον· πολλοὺς δ' αὖ καὶ τῶν [μὴ?] τῆς καθαρᾶς καὶ εὐσεβοῦς ὄντων Χριστιανῶν γινώμης τοῦτο μὴ γινωρίζειν ἐσήμανα

and subsequently by the antagonists of the Montanists.[20] The thousand years' reign was represented as the great Sabbath which should begin very soon; or, as many supposed, after the lapse of the six thousand years of the world's age,[21] with the first resurrection, and should afford great joys to the righteous.[22] Till then the souls of the departed were to be kept in the underworld,[23] and the opinion that they should be taken up to heaven immediately after death, was considered a gnostic heresy.[24] In reference to the advancement of the various Christian interests, and in like manner also to the confirmation of those developments of doctrine already mentioned, *the spurious literature* which had arisen and continually increased among Jews and Christians, was of great importance. The Christians made use of such expressions and writings as had already been falsely attri-

σοι. Τοὺς γὰρ λεγομένους μὲν Χριστιανούς, ὄντας δὲ ἀθέους καὶ ἀσεβεῖς αἱρεσιώτας, ὅτι κατὰ πάντα βλάσφημα καὶ ἄθεα καὶ ἀνόητα διδάσκουσιν, ἐδήλωσά σοι.—Εἰ γὰρ καὶ συνεβάλετε ὑμεῖς τισὶ λεγομένοις Χριστιανοῖς, καὶ τοῦτο μὴ ὁμογολοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ βλασφημεῖν τολμῶσι τὸν θεὸν Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ τὸν θεὸν Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ τὸν θεὸν Ἰακώβ, οἳ καὶ λέγουσι μὴ εἶναι νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν, ἀλλὰ ἅμα τῷ ἀποθνήσκειν τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, μὴ ὑπολάβητε αὐτοὺς Χριστιανούς.—Ἐγὼ δὲ, καὶ εἴ τινές εἰσιν ὀρθογνώμονες κατὰ πάντα Χριστιανοί, καὶ σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν γενήσεσθαι ἐπιστάμεθα, καὶ χίλια ἔτη ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ οἰκοδομηθείσῃ καὶ κοσμηθείσῃ καὶ πλατυνθείσῃ, ὡς οἱ προφῆται Ἰεζεκιὴλ (37, 12 ss.) καὶ Ἡσαΐας (65, 17 ss.) καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ὁμολογοῦσιν. Dalläus, Münscher, Münter, Schwegler, and others, have regarded the insertion of μή as necessary in the first sentence. On the other side see Semisch Justin d. M. ii. 468 and Otto ad h. l.

[20] See above § 48, note 14.

[21] Apoc. 20, 4—6. This calculation was based on Ps. xc. 4. Cf. Barnabas, c. 15. Justin. dial. c. Tryph. c. 81. Iren. v. 23; and is also found in the Rabbins of this period, see Corodi's Gesch. d. Chiliasmus i. 328.

[22] See the descriptions in Justin. dial. c. Tryph. c. 80 after Jes. 65, 17 ss. Iren. v. 25—36. Tertull. adv. Marc. iii. 24.

[23] In the Greek fathers Ἅιδης (the שְׁאוֹל of the Hebrews), cf. Tertull. de anima c. 7: si quid tormenti sive solatii anima praecerpit in carcere seu diversorio inferum; in igni vel in sinu Abrahae: probata erit corporalitas animae. Adv. Marcion iv. c. 34: Eam itaque regionem sinum dico Abrahae, etsi non coelestem, sublimiorem tamen inferis, interim refrigerium praebituram animabus justorum, donec consummatio rerum resurrectionem omnium plenitudine mercedis expungat. A copious description of Ἅιδης, χωρίον ὑπόγειον, ἐν ᾧ φῶς κόσμου οὐκ ἐπιλάμπει, see in Hippolytus adv. Platonem (Opp. ed. Fabricius i. 220). cf. J. A. Dietelmaieri hist. dogmatis de descensu Christi ad inferos. ed. 2. Altorf. 1762, 8, cap. i. et. ii.

[24] Justinus above not. 19, Tertull. below § 53, not. 40.

buted by Jews, from partiality to their religion, to honoured persons of antiquity,[25] and altered them in part to suit their own wants, such as *the book of Enoch* and *the fourth book of Ezra.*[26] But writings of this kind were also fabricated anew by Christians, who quieted their conscience respecting the forgery, with the idea of their good intention,[27] for the purpose of giving greater impressiveness to their doctrines and admonitions by the reputation of respectable names, of animating their suffering brethren to steadfastness, and of gaining over their opponents to Christianity.[28] Hence there now appeared, in particular *the testaments of the twelve patriarchs,*[29] and the Ἀναβατικὸν Ἡσαΐου,[30]

[25] See above § 31. Thus, verses were falsely attributed to Orpheus, respecting the unity of God, in which even Abraham and Moses appeared (L. C. Valckenaeri diatr. de Aristobulo Judaeo, ed. J. Luzac. Lugd. Bat. 1806, 4, p. 13, Lobeck Aglaophamus i. 438 ss.), to Linus, Homer, and Hesiod, in favour of the Sabbath (Valckenaer. p. 8, 116. Valckenaer regards Aristobulus as the deceiver, though without sufficient reason), to Sophocles, Æschylus, and Euripides, respecting the unity, power, and righteousness of God (Graecae tragoediae principum, Aeschyli, Sophoclis, Euripidis, num ea, quae supersunt, et genuina omnia sint. Scrips. Aug. Boeckhius. Heidelb. 1808, 8, p. 146). Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, and Clement of Alexandria, make use of these productions.

[26] See above § 31, not. 2 and 3.

[27] The anecdote respecting the Acta Pauli et Theclae is characteristic, apud. Tertull. de baptismo c. 17: Quod si quae Paulo perperam adscripta sunt ad licentiam mulierum docendi tinguendique, defendunt, sciant in Asia presbyterum, qui eam scripturam construxit, quasi titulo Pauli de suo cumulans, convictum atque confessum id se amore Pauli fecisse, loco decessisse.

[28] A one-sided view is given by Mosheim de causis suppositorum librorum inter Christianos saec. i. et ii. (Dissertt. ad hist. eccl. pertin. vol. i. p. 217 ss.) Comp. C. J. Nitzsch de testamentis xii. Patriarcharum. p. 1 ss.

[29] In Fabricii cod. pseudepigraphus v. t. i. 496. Comp. Veesenmeyer's Beiträge zur Gesch. d. Literatur u. Reformation. Ulm 1792, 8, S. 1 ff. In their apocalyptic part, they are modelled after the apocalypse of John, Daniel, and especially the book of Enoch. See Lücke's Einl. in die Offenb. Joh. S. 123. Wieseler's die 70 Wochen u. die 63 Jahrwochen d. Proph. Daniel. S. 226. C. J. Nitzsch de testamentis xii. Patriarcharum comm. Viteberg. 1810, 4.

[30] Extant in an Ethiopic version, Ascensio Isaiae vatis aethiop. cum versione lat. anglicanaque ed. Rich. Laurence. Oxon. 1819, 8: the old Latin fragments which Angelo Maius nova collectio scriptorum veterum iii. ii. 238 has published, are corrected and criticised by Nitzsch in the Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1830, ii. 209. Another Latin translation preserved entire (ed. Venetiis 1522, 8) has been recently published by me, together with the Greek fragment in Epiphanius, and the Latin in Mai: Vetus

the latter so peculiar in its contents, that in later times heretics could still use it. To make an impression on the heathen, suppositious predictions, relating especially to Christ and the last things, were constantly ascribed to *the sybil*.[31] To them were added those of *Hystaspes*.[32]

§ 53.

ECCLESIASTICAL LIFE.

As the prevailing desire was now to compare the Mosaic institute with the Christian, of which it was regarded as the type, and to trace out an analogy even in their individual features, the idea soon occurred to the mind, of comparing the Christian officers in the church with the Mosaic priesthood,[1] and of giving

translatio latina Visionis Jesaiae, ed atque praefatione et notis illustra (a Göttingen easter programm). That the work was not necessarily written before 68, as Laurence supposes, is shown by Gfrörer Jahrhundert des Heils i. 66.—Comp. Gesenius commentar über den Jesaias i. 45 ff. Lücke l. c. S. 125.

[31] See above § 31, note 4. According to Bleek in Schleiermacher's, De Wette's and Lücke's theol. Zeitschrift ii. 231, old Jewish and Christian oracles were composed under Hadrian by an Egyptian Christian, and, after several enlargements, put together so as to constitute books iii.—v. The eighth book belongs to the time of Marcus Aurelius, books vii. and vi. to the third century, i. and ii. to the middle of the fifth.

[32] Ammianus Marcellinus xxiii. 6: Magic is divinorum incorruptissimus cultus, cujus scientiae saeculis priscis multa ex Chaldaeorum arcanis Bactrianus addidit Zoroastres: deinde Hystaspes rex prudentissimus Darii pater. The latter travelled into India to the Brahmins, eorumque monitu rationes mundani motus et siderum, purosque sacrorum ritus quantum colligere potuit eruditus, ex his quae didicit, aliqua sensibus magorum infudit: quae illi cum disciplinis praesentiendi futura, per suam quisque progeniem, posteris aetatibus tradunt. Ch. G. F. Walch de Hystaspe ejusque vaticiniis apud Patres i. d. Commentationes Soc. Reg. Gotting. i. 3.—So early as in the Praedicatio Petri (which belongs to the beginning of the second century, see § 27, note 5) the sybil and Hystaspes are recommended (cfr. Clemens Alex. Strom vi. p. 761), and by Justin Martyr several times quoted. According to Celsus ap. Orig. c. Cels. vii. p. 368, they were adulterated and used by a Christian party, whom he thence calls Σιβυλλισταί, lib. v. p. 272.

[1] The whole Christian world is called, in 1 Pet. ii. 5, ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον; v. 9, βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα. The passage in Clem. Rom. ep. 1, c. 40, speaks of the Old Testament economy, and does not belong here. On the contrary, traces of a peculiar Christian priesthood appear in the Test. xii.

them the very same titles (summus sacerdos, sacerdotes, Levitae). As a body, they were called by way of eminence, κλῆρος, viz. τοῦ θεοῦ, κληρικοί;[2] among the Latins, ordo;[3] in opposition to the λαός, plebs, λαϊκοι.[4] The idea, however, of a universal Christian priesthood was still maintained.[5] The influence of the bishop

Patr. cff. Nitzsch de Test. xii. Patr. p. 19. Also in Polycratis ep. ad Victorem apud Euseb. v. 24, § 1: Ἰωάννης, ὃς ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορηκώς, although πέταλον (cf. Exod. xxix. 6; Lev. viii. 9) stands here only tropically. cf. J. F. Cotta de lamina pontificali App. Joannis, Jacobi et Marci. Tubing. 1755, 4. The idea is first found in a distinct form in Tertullian.

[2] 1 Pet. v. 3, Christians are called κλῆροι, a band belonging to God. In like manner, Ignatius ep. ad Eph. c. 11: ὁ κλῆρος Ἐφεσίων τῶν χριστιανῶν. In a narrower sense κλῆρος τῶν μαρτύρων in Epist. Eccl. Vienn. et Lugd. ap. Euseb. v. 1, § 4. The clergy are called so early as in Tertullian, clerus, and they afterwards cited in their own favour Numb. xviii. 20, Deut. x. 9, xviii. 1, 2: κύριος αὐτὸς κλῆρος τοῖς Λευίταις; though here God is κλῆρος, not the Levites. In like manner, they appropriated to themselves, in the fourth century, the names christiani and christianitas as their peculiar right (cf. Cod. Theod. v. 5, 2; xii. 1, 50 and 123; xii. 1, 123, du Fresne glossar. ad h. v.) cf. J. H. Boehmer de differentia inter Clericos et Laicos diss. (xii. dissertt. juris eccl. ant. ad Plinium, &c., p. 340 ss.) A different view is given by Neander, KG. i. i. 333.

[3] Borrowed from the town councillors in the municipal boroughs, who, according to the analogy of the Roman senate, were styled ordo Decurionum, or ordo, in opposition to plebs and plebeii. cf. Digest. Lib. L. Tit. 2. de Decurionibus. Boehmer l. c. p. 342. Hoeck's röm. Gesch. vom. Verfall. der Republ. i. ii. 159. Even the verb ordinare, i. e. ordinem dare (Sueton. Vespas. c. 23), had already received in Cyprian an ecclesiastical use.

[4] So λαός stands also in opposition to the Jewish priests, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 14; Luke i. 10, 21.

[5] Iren. iv. 20. Omnes enim justi sacerdotalem habent ordinem. Tertullian. de exhortat. castitatis c. 7: Nonne et laici sacerdotes sumus? —Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit ecclesiae auctoritas, et honor per ordinis consessum sanctificatus. Adeo ubi ecclesiastici ordinis non est consessus, et offers et tinguis, et sacerdos es tibi solus. Sed ubi tres, ecclesia est, licet laici.—Igitur si habes jus sacerdotis in temet ipso, ubi necesse est, habeas oportet etiam disciplinam sacerdotis, ubi necesse est, habere jus sacerdotis. (cf. de baptismo c. 17, de monog. c. 7, 12, de corona mil. c. 3. See Neander's Antignosticus S. 154.) Against the impartial explanation of this language given by Nic. Rigaltius: Gabr. Aubespine (Albaspinaeus) de l'eucharistie. Controversy concerning offerre in this place (see on it below note 15), and de jure laicorum sacerdotali. For Rigaltius (Hugo Grotius) de administratione coenae, ubi pastores non sunt. 1638. Claudius Salmasius and others. On the other side are D. Petavius, H. Dodwell, and others. The history of the controversy may be found in Chr. M. Pfaffii diss. de consecratione

necessarily increased when *synods* began to be common,[6] at which the bishop chiefly represented his congregation (παροικία),[7] although the presbyters also had a voice along with him.[8] All congregations were independent of one another, although some had a peculiar reputation more than others, on account of many circumstances, ex. gr. their apostolic origin, the importance of the city to which they belonged, or because they were mother churches. Many such circumstances united in procuring for *Rome*, particularly in the west, an especial influence, even so early as the period of which we are speaking.[9]

Public worship was extremely simple. Without temples, altars, or images, the Christians assembled in houses appointed for the purpose, and, in times of persecution, in solitary places,[10]

veterum eucharistica § 23 (in his Syntagma dissertt. theologg. p. 533). Cotta ad Gerhardi loc. theol. x. 21. cf. Boehmer l. c. p. 272, 485. Neander's Denkw. i. 179.

[6] The first synods held against the Montanists (160—170), Euseb. v. 16, regularly returned, and are first mentioned in Tertullian de jejun. 13. Aguntur praeterea per Graecias illa certis in locis concilia ex universis ecclesiis, per quae et altiora quaeque in commune tractantur, et ipsa repraesentatio totius nominis Christiani magna veneratione celebratur. Perhaps an imitation of the Amphictyonic council, which still continued (Pausan. x. 8). Comp. Ueber den Ursprung der Kirchenversammlungen in (J. M. Abele) Magazin für Kirchenrecht u. KG. Leipzig 1778, St. 2, S. 479 ff., W. L. C. Ziegler in Henke's neuem Magazin für Religionsphilosophie, &c. i. 125 ff.

[7] Irenaeus apud Euseb. v. 24, § 5. The Christians considered themselves on this earth as πάροικοι, according to 1 Peter i. 17; ii. 11. Comp. Epist. ad Diognet. c. 5: πατρίδας οἰκοῦσιν ἰδίας, ἀλλ' ὡς πάροικοι,—ἐπὶ γῆς διατρίβουσιν, ἀλλ' ἐν οὐρανῷ πολιτεύονται. Hence the churches designated themselves companies of strangers, Clemens. Rom. init. epist. i. Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ παροικούσῃ Κόρινθον. In like manner Epist. Eccl. Smyrn. apud Euseb. iv. 15, § 1.

[8] The ancient form is apparent from the introduction of the Conc. Eliberitani ann. 305: Cum concedissent sancti et religiosi Episcopi,—item Presbyteri,—residentibus cunctis, adstantibus diaconibus et omni plebe, Episcopi universi dixerunt.

[9] To these belonged also the support of other churches. Dionys. Corinth. ad Rom. epist. (ap. Euseb. iv. 23): ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ὑμῖν ἔθος ἐστὶ τοῦτο, πάντας μὲν ἀδελφοὺς ποικίλως εὐεργετεῖν, ἐκκλησίαις τε πολλαῖς ταῖς κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν ἐφόδια πέμπειν· ὧδε μὲν τὴν τῶν δεομένων πενίαν ἀναψύχοντας, ἐν μετάλλοις δὲ ἀδελφοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν ἐπιχορηγοῦντας.

[10] Celsus ap. Orig. c. Cels. viii. p. 389: βωμοὺς καὶ ἀγάλματα καὶ νεὼς ἰδρύσθαι φεύγουσι. Minucii Felicis Octavius c. 10, cur nullas aras habent, templa nulla, nulla nota simulacra?—Towards the end of the second cen-

sometimes even in the night, particularly on the night before Easter.[11] The members of the church brought with them voluntary offerings, from which was taken what was necessary for the solemnization of *the Lord's supper* (εὐχαριστία), and *the agape*,[12] which was still usually connected with it. The remainder be-

tury, buildings appear to have been devoted here and there exclusively to the worship of God. Tertull. de idolol. c. 7: ab idolis in ecclesiam venire, de adversarii officina in domum Dei venire. Comp. Chron. Edessen. above § 39, not. 4. The expression, ἐκκλησία, is frequently used even so early of the places of assembling, ex. gr. Tertull. de cor. mil. c. 3 below not. 25. Clem. Alex. strom. vii. p. 846.

[11] Tertull. ad uxor. ii. c. 4: Quis (infidelis maritus uxorem christianam) nocturnis convocationibus, si ita oportuerit, a latere suo adimi libenter feret? Quis denique solemnibus paschae abnoctantem securus sustinebit? Lactant. institt. vii. 19: Haec est nox, quae a nobis propter adventum regis ac dei nostri pervigilio celebratur. Cujus noctis duplex ratio est, quod in ea et vitam tum recepit, quum passus est, et postea orbis terrae regnum recepturus est. Hieronymus comm. in Matth. lib. iv. ad Matth. xxv. 6: Traditio Judaeorum est, Christum media nocte venturum in similitudinem Aegyptii temporis, quando pascha celebratum est, et exterminator venit, et Dominus super tabernacula transiit, et sanguine agni postes nostrarum frontium consecrati sunt. Unde reor et traditionem apostolicam permansisse, ut in die vigiliarum Paschae ante noctis dimidium populos dimittere non liceat, exspectantes adventum Christi. Et postquam illud tempus transierit, securitate praesumta, festum cuncti agunt diem.

[12] Not always, indeed, on account of the persecutions. According to Tertull. de corona militis c. 3, the eucharist was celebrated even in antelucanis coetibus. Also in Justin's description, apol. i. c. 85, the agape is not mentioned: ἔπειτα (after the common prayers) προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος, καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος. καὶ οὗτος λαβὼν, αἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου ἀναπέμπει, καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατηξιῶσθαι τούτων παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιεῖται. Οὗ συντελέσαντος τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν, πᾶς ὁ παρὼν λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων ἀμήν.—ἐπευφημήσαντος παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι διδόασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου τῶν ὕδατος, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι. A description of the agape is given in Tertullian's apologet. c. 39: Coena nostra de nomine rationem sui ostendit, id vocatur quod dilectio penes graecos. Quantiscunque sumptibus constet, lucrum est pietatis nomine facere sumptum, siquidem inopes quosque refrigerio isto juvamus. —Non prius discumbitur, quam oratio ad Deum praegustetur; editur quantum esurientes cupiunt, bibitur quantum pudicis est utile. Ita saturantur, ut qui meminerint etiam per noctem adorandum deum sibi esse; ita fabulantur, ut qui sciunt dominum audire. Post aquam manualem et lumina, ut quisque de scripturis sanctis vel de proprio ingenio potest, provocatur in medium deo canere; hinc probatur quomodo biberit. Aeque oratio convivium dirimit, &c.

longed to the clergy and the poor, for whom also they provided by monthly contributions.[13] After the clergy had become a priestly caste, it was the more necessary to look for a sacrifice in Christianity, because the ancient world generally could not conceive of divine worship without sacrifice. For this purpose the solemnity of the supper presented several points of comparison. First of all, *the prayer*, which indeed had always been considered spiritual sacrifice.[14] But next, the gifts of the church members, as also the bread and wine set apart by the bishop by prayer as holy food, came to be considered as offerings dedicated to God. Of both the same expressions were used, προσφέρειν, προσφορά, offerre, oblatio: both were compared with the Old Testament sacrifices and first fruits.[15] Accord-

[13] Tertull. apolog. c. 39: modicam unusquisque stipem menstrua die, vel quum velit, et si modo velit, et si modo possit, apponit. Hence Cyprian. ep. 28 and 34: divisiones mensurnae. sportulae Presbyterorum. Ep. 66: sportulantes fratres. Ziegler über die Einkünfte des Klerus u. d. Kirche in den ersten drei Jahrh. in Henke's neuem Magazine für Religionsphilosophie. Bd. 4, S. 1 ff. Münter primord. Eccl. Afric. p. 63 ss.

[14] 1 Peter ii. 5, Justin. M. dial. c. Tryph. c. 116: ἡμεῖς—ἀρχιερατικὸν τὸ ἀληθινὸν γένος ἐσμὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ.—οὐ δέχεται δὲ παρ' οὐδενὸς Θυσίας ὁ Θεός, εἰ μὴ διὰ τῶν ἱερέων αὐτοῦ. c. 117: Πάσας οὖν διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τούτου Θυσίας, ἃς παρέδωκεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς γίνεσθαι, τουτέστιν ἐπὶ τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου τὰς ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ τῆς γῆς γενομένας ὑπὸ τῶν Χριστιανῶν, προλαβὼν ὁ Θεὸς, μαρτυρεῖ εὐαρέστους ὑπάρχειν αὐτῷ.—Ὅτι μεν οὖν καὶ εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίαι, ὑπὸ τῶν ἀξίων γινόμεναι, τέλειαι μέναι καὶ εὐάρεστοί εἰσι τῷ Θεῷ Θυσίαι, καὶ αὐτός φημι. Ταῦτα γὰρ μόνα καὶ Χριστιανοὶ παρέλαβον ποιεῖν, καὶ ἐπ' ἀναμνήσει δὲ τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν ξηρᾶς τε καὶ ὑγρᾶς, ἐν ᾗ καὶ τοῦ πάθους, ὃ πέπονθε δι' αὐτοὺς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, μέμνηται.

[15] Justin. M. dial. c. Tryph. c. 41: Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ὑφ' ἡμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν προσφερομένων αὐτῷ Θυσιῶν, τουτέστι τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου ὁμοίως τῆς εὐχαριστίας προλέγει τότε (namely, Mal. i. 10—12). Irenaeus iv. 17, 5: Sed et suis discipulis dans consilium, primitias Deo offerre ex suis creaturis, non quasi indigenti, sed ut ipsi nec infructuosi, nec ingrati sint, eum, qui ex creatura est panis, accepit, et gratias egit, dicens: Hoc est corpus meum. Et calicem similiter, qui est ex ea creatura, quae est secundum nos, suum sanguinem confessus est: et novi Testamenti novam docuit oblationem, quam Ecclesia ab Apostoli accipiens, in universo mundo offert Deo, ei qui alimenta nobis praestat, primitias suorum munerum in novo Testamento, de quo in XII. Prophetis Malachias sic praesignificavit (Mal. i. 10, 11), &c. Cap. xviii. 1: Igitur Ecclesiae oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri in universo mundo, purum sacrificium reputatum est apud Deum, et acceptum est ei: non quod indigeat a nobis sacrificium, sed quoniam is qui offert glorificatur ipse in eo quod offert, si acceptetur munus ejus. Irenaei fragm. II. ed.

ingly, as the Mosaic law of first fruits, and, in consequence, the law of tithes also, appeared to be still valid,[16] the Christians obtained in them a rule for their oblations, without, however, any kind of external compulsion being used for enjoining the observance of them. The eucharist being considered the symbol of the intimate communion of the church with itself, and with Christ, it was also sent to the absent as a token of this communion,[17] and taken by those who were present to their homes.[18]

Baptism was preceded by instruction,[19] fasting, and prayer. The baptism of children was not universal, and was even occa-

Pfaffii: Προσφέρομεν γὰρ τῷ Θεῷ τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας, εὐχαριστοῦντες αὐτῷ, ὅτι τῇ γῇ ἐκέλευσε ἐκφῦσαι τοὺς καρποὺς τούτους εἰς τροφὴν ἡμετέραν, καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὴν προσφορὰν τελέσαντες ἐκκαλοῦμεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὅπως ἀποφήνῃ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην καὶ τὸν ἄρτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα οἱ μεταλαβόντες τούτων τῶν ἀντιτύπων τῆς ἀφέσεως τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ τῆς ζωῆς αἰωνίου τύχωσιν. Cf. Chr. M. Pfaffii diss. de oblatione Veterum eucharistica in his Syntagma dissertt. theologg. Stutt. 1720, p. 219 ss. Stäudlin's History of the dogma of the sacrifice of the Lord's Supper, in Schleusner's u. Stäudlin's Götting. Biblioth. d. neuesten theol. Literatur ii. ii. 163. This idea of oblations is expressed not only in the sacrificial prayers of the old liturgies, (see Constitt. Apostl. viii. c. 12, comp. Pfaffii syntagma, p. 378 ss.), but also even now in the commencing words of the canon missae of the Romish church: Te igitur, Clementissime pater,—supplices rogamus ac petimus, uti accepta habeas ac benedicas haec dona, haec munera, haec sancta sacrificia illibata, (i.e., the still unconsecrated bread and wine).

[16] Irenaeus iv. 18, 1: Offerre igitur oportet Deo primitias ejus creatura, sicut et Moyses ait: Non apparebis vacuus ante conspectum Domini Dei tui (Deut. xvi. 16).—2: Et non genus oblationum reprobatum est: oblationes enim et illic, oblationes autem et hic: sacrificia in populo, sacrificia in Ecclesia: sed species immutata est tantum, quippe cum jam non a servis, sed a liberis offeratur. Origenes in Num. hom. xi. 1: Primitias omnium frugum, omniumque pecudum sacerdotibus lex mandat offerri.—Hanc ergo legem observari etiam secundum literam, sicut et alia nonnulla, necessarium puto. 2. Quomodo abundat justitia nostra plus quam scribarum et Pharisacorum, si illi de fructibus terrae suae gustare non audent, priusquam primitias sacerdotibus offerant, et Levitis decimas separent: et ego nihil horum faciens, fructibus terrae ita abutar, ut sacerdos nesciat, Levites ignoret, divinum altare non sentiat? Constitutt. Apost. ii. c. 25: αἱ τότε θυσίαι, νῦν εὐχαί, καὶ δεήσεις, καὶ εὐχαριστίαι· αἱ τότε ἀπαρχαί, καὶ δεκάται, καὶ ἀφαιρέματα, καὶ δῶρα, νῦν προσφοραί, αἱ διὰ τῶν ὁσίων ἐπισκόπων προσφερόμεναι κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀποθανόντος.

[17] Cf. Justin above, note 12. Irenaeus ap. Euseb. v. 24, § 5: The presbyters of one church ἔπεμπον εὐχαριστίαν to those of another.

[18] Tertull. ad uxorem ii. c. 5. De orat. c. 14.

[19] On the creed see above, § 51, note 13.

sionally disapproved.[20] While Christians were supposed to be engaged in constant warfare with the world and the devil under the banner of Christ,[21] they generally used the sign of the cross,[22] and often exorcism,[23] as a powerful defence against the machinations of evil spirits. Probably they already began to apply the latter in the case of those persons who, renouncing the prince of this world, prepared themselves for baptism.[24] Many new usages were connected with baptism itself towards the end of the second century.[25]

[20] Tertull. de baptismo, c. 18: Itaque pro cujusque personae conditione ac dispositione, etiam aetate, cunctatio baptismi utilior est: praecipue tamen circa parvulos. Quid enim necesse est, sponsores etiam periculo ingeri? quia et ipsi per mortalitatem destituere promissiones suas possunt, et proventu malae indolis falli. Ait quidem Dominus: Nolite illos prohibere ad me venire (Matth. xix. 14). Veniant ergo, dum adolescunt, veniant dum discunt, dum, quo veniant, docentur: fiant Christiani, quum Christum nosse potuerint. Quid festinat innocens aetas ad remissionem peccatorum? Cautius agetur in saecularibus, ut cui substantia terrena non creditur, divina credatur. Norint petere salutem ut petenti dedisse videaris. Non minore de causa innupti quoque procrastinandi, in quibus tentatio praeparata est tam virginibus per maturitatem, quam viduis per vagationem, donec aut nubant, aut continentiae corroborentur. Si qui pondus intelligant baptismi, magis timebunt consecutionem quam dilationem: fides integra secura est de salute. Cf. G. Walli hist. baptismi infantum, lat. vertit J. L. Schlosser (P. i. Bremae 1748, P. ii. Hamb. 1753, 4). P. i., p. 57 ss.

[21] Tertull. ad Martyres, c. 3: Vocati sumus ad militiam Dei vivi jam tunc, cum in sacramenti verba respondimus, &c. De corona mil. c. 11.

[22] Tertull. adv. Marc. iii. 18, de cor. militis c. 3. But no adoration to the cross, Minucius Fel. c. 29: Cruces etiam nec colimus, nec optamus.

[23] Tertull. de idololatr. c. 11 of the Christian Thurarius: Qua constantia exorcizabit alumnos suos (i.e., the demons, ironically), quibus domum suam cellariam praestat? De cor. militis, c. 11, of the Christian soldiers: quos interdiu exorcismis fugavit, noctibus defensabit, incumbens et requiescens super pilum, quo perfossum est latus Christi?

[24] Barnabas epist. c. 16: Πρὸ τοῦ ἡμᾶς πιστεῦσαι τῷ θεῷ, ἦν ἡμῶν τὸ κατοικητήριον τῆς καρδίας φθαρτὸν καὶ ἀσθενές,—οἶκος δαιμόνων, διὰ τὸ ποιεῖν ὅσα ἦν ἐναντία τῷ θεῷ. From this view, the application of exorcism in the case of candidates for baptism resulted as a matter of course.

[25] The ceremony of baptism was still very simple, as described in Justin. apol. i. c. 79. Otherwise in Tertull. de cor. mil. c. 3: Aquam adituri, ibidem, sed et aliquanto prius in ecclesia, sub antistitis manu contestamur, nos renunciare diabolo (ἀποτάσσεσθαι διαβόλῳ) et pompae et angelis ejus. Dehinc ter mergitamur, amplius aliquid respondentes quam dominus in Evangelio determinavit. Inde suscepti lactis et mellis concordiam praegustamus (qua infantamur, adv. Marc. i. c. 14): ex-

The concluding of a marriage was announced by the bishop of the church; and with this was very naturally connected the giving of his blessing on the new union.[26] Second marriages were condemned by many in all cases,[27] and began to be expressly disallowed in the case of the clergy.[28] But when *the Montanists* forbade them universally, they met with opposition. *Fasts*, which were looked upon as a suitable preparation for prayer, and *celibacy*, were valued, but continued to be left to the free choice of every one,[29] although the opinion of Philo, that the marriage intercourse was something that rendered a person unclean had been already introduced.[30] Many Christians devoted them-

que ea die lavacro quotidiano per totam hebdomadam abstinemus. There is an opinion that the last-mentioned rite was borrowed from the heathen mysteries; see Mosheim de rebus Christ. ante Const. M. p. 321. An excursus to the whole passage is given in Neander's Antignosticus, S. 149 ff.—Tertull. de baptismo c. 7: Exinde egressi de lavacro perungimur benedicta unctione (*χρίσματι*) de pristina disciplina, qua ungi oleo de cornu in sacerdotium solebant. (This anointing, according to Thilo Acta Thomae p. 177 was of Gnostic origin). Cap. 8: Dehinc manus imponitur, per benedictionem advocans et invitans spiritum sanctum (*χειροθεσία*). Jo. Dallaeus de duobus Latinorum ex unctione sacramentis. Genev. 1659, 4, p. 126 ss. Neander's KG. i. i. 543.

[26] Ignat. Epist. ad Polycarp. § 5. Tertull. ad uxor. ii. c. 9: Unde sufficiam ad enarrandam felicitatem ejus matrimonii, quod ecclesia conciliat, et confirmat oblatio, et obsignatum angeli renunciant, pater rato habet? De pudicit. c. 4: Penes nos occultae quoque conjunctiones, i.e., non prius apud Ecclesiam professae, juxta mocchiam et fornicationem judicari periclitantur. Cf. Jo. Seldeni uxor Ebraica lib. ii. c. 28. Concerning the marriage of the first Christians see in (Abele) Mag. f. Kirchenrecht. Bd. 1, S. 261 ff. Münter's Sinnbilder d. alten. Christen. Heft 2. S. 112 ff.

[27] Athenagoras deprec. c. 28: *ὁ δεύτερος (γάμος) εὐπρεπὴς ἐστι μοιχεία.* On the other hand, Hermae Past. lib. i. mand. iv. 4: Si vir vel mulier alicujus decesserit, et nupserit aliquis illorum, numquid peccat? Qui nubit non peccat, inquit, sed si per se manserit, magnum sibi conquirit honorem apud Dominum. So also Clem. Alex. strom. iii. p. 548. Cf. Cotelerius ad Hermae l. c.

[28] Tertull. ad uxor. i. 7: disciplina ecclesiae et praescriptio Apostoli—digamos non sinit praesidere. Yet de monogam. 12: Quot enim et digami praesident apud vos, insultantes utique Apostolo! Derived from 1 Tim. iii. 2. Tertullian read also in Lev. xxi. Sacerdotes mei non plus nubent (de exhort. castit. 7). Comp. Heydenreich's Pastoralbriefe Pauli, Bd. 1, S. 166 ff.

[29] Even for the clergy: G. Calixti de conjug. clericorum. Helmst. 1631, ed. Henke ibid. 1783. 4. ii. 181. Theiner's Einführung der erzwungenen Ehelosigkeit bei den Geistl. i. 69.

[30] Semisch Justin d. M. i. 199.

selves to a certain abstinence (Ἀσκηταί);[31] but all forced and artificial asceticism was disapproved.[32] The only custom of the kind which was universal, was the celebration of the passion-time of Jesus by a fast; but this was observed in very different ways. In other cases, for voluntary fasting and prayer (stationes, stationum semijejunia, *Tert. de jejun. c.* 13) they chose *Wednesday* and *Friday*.[33] *Sunday* and *the Sabbath* were ob-

[31] This appellation, formerly applied to the athletae (Plato de republ. iii. p. 297), was afterwards by Philo (de praem. et poen. 914, 917, 920) to the exercises of virtue in the wise. So also among the heathen philosophers (Arrian. diss. in Epict. iii. c. 12, *περὶ ἀσκήσεως*. Artemidorus, about 100, Oneirocrit. iv. c. 33, says of a certain philosopher, Alexander: ἔμελε δὲ αὐτῷ ὅντι ἀνδρὶ ἀσκητῇ οὔτε γάμου, οὔτε κοινωνίας, οὔτε πλούτου.) Athenagorae deprec. c. 28. Εὕροις δ' ἂν πολλοὺς τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν καὶ ἄνδρας καὶ γυναῖκας καταγηράσκοντας ἀγάμους, ἐλπίδι τοῦ μᾶλλον συνέσεσθαι τῷ Θεῷ. Tertull. de cultu foem. 11. Non enim et multi ita faciunt, et se spadonatui obsignant propter regnum Dei (Matth. xix. 12), tam fortem et utique permissam voluptatem sponte ponentes (continentes, ἐγκρατεῖς cf. de vel. virg. 3)? Numquid non aliqui ipsam Dei creaturam sibi interdicunt, abstinentes vino et animalibus esculentis, quorum fructus nulli periculo aut sollicitudini adjacent, sed humilitatem animae suae in victus quoque castigatione Deo immolant? Galenus see above § 41, not. 16. cf. Sal. Deyling de Ascetis veterum, in ejusd. Observatt. sacr. lib. iii.

[32] Dionys. Corinth. (ap. Euseb. iv. 23), in his letter to the Gnossians, exhorts bishop Pinytus, μὴ βαρὺ φορτίον ἐπάναγκες τὸ περὶ ἁγνείας τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐπιτιθέναι, τῆς δὲ τῶν πολλῶν κατασκοπάζεσθαι ἀπλανείας.—Ex epist. Eccl. Vienn. et Lugd. ap. Euseb. v. 3: Ἀλκιβιάδου γάρ τινος ἐξ αὐτῶν, πάνυ αὐχμηρὸν βιοῦντος βίον, καὶ μηδενὸς ὅλως τὸ πρότερον μεταλαμβάνοντος, ἀλλ' ἢ ἄρτῳ μόνῳ καὶ ὕδατι χρωμένου, πειρωμένου τε καὶ ἐν τῇ εἱρκτῇ οὕτω διάγειν, Ἀττάλῳ μετὰ τὸν πρῶτον ἀγῶνα, ὃν ἐν τῷ ἀμφιθεάτρῳ ἤνυσεν, ἀπεκαλύφθη, ὅτι μὴ καλῶς ποιοίη ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης, μὴ χρώμενος τοῖς κτίσμασι τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἄλλοις τύπον σκανδάλου ὑπολειπόμενος. πεισθεὶς δὲ Ἀλκιβιάδης πάντων ἀνέδην μετελάμβανε κα ηὐχαρίστει τῷ Θεῷ.

[33] Respecting the Stationes, watches of milites Christi, which were usually continued till three o'clock in the afternoon, see Hermae Pastor iii. Sim. 5 and Fabricius ad h. l. Gu. Beveregii cod. canonum eccl. primitivae vindicatus lib. iii. c. 10.—Tertull. de jejun. c. 2. Certe in evangelio illos dies jejuniis determinatos putant (Psychici), in quibus ablatus est sponsus (Matth. ix. 15): et hos esse jam solos legitimos jejuniorum christianorum. (De orat. 14, die Paschae communis et quasi publica jejunii religio est).—sic et Apostolos observasse, nullum aliud imponentes jugum certorum et in commune omnibus obeundorum jejuniorum: proin de nec stationum, quae et ipsae suos quidem dies habeant, quartae feria et sextae, passim tamen currant, neque sub lege praecepti, neque ultra supremam dici, quando et orationes fere hora nona concludat, de Petri exemplo, quod actis refertur. (De orat. 14, statio de militari exemplo nomen accipit: nam et militia Dei sumus). C. 13, Bene

served as festivals; the latter, however, without Jewish superstition. In the celebration of the passover, there was a difference between *the churches of Asia Minor* and *those of the west.*[34] The former adhered to the Jewish passover feast, giving it a reference to Christ;[35] the latter, on the other hand, kept up the

autem, quod et Episcopi universae plebi mandare jejunia assolent—ex aliqua sollicitudinis ecclesiasticae causa.—Irenaeus ad Victorem ap. Euseb. v: 24. 4: *οὐδὲ γὰρ μόνον περὶ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐστὶν ἡ ἀμφισβήτησις, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τοῦ εἴδους αὐτοῦ τῆς νηστείας· οἱ μὲν γὰρ οἴονται μίαν ἡμέραν δεῖν αὐτοὺς νηστεύειν, οἱ δὲ δύο, οἱ δὲ καὶ πλείονας, οἱ δὲ τεσσαράκοντα ὥρας ἡμερινάς τε καὶ νυκτερινὰς συμμετροῦσι τὴν ἡμέραν αὐτῶν.* On the last words see the Excursus in Heinichen. Euseb. t. iii. p. 377 ss. I am inclined to read *τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτῶν.* "Others measure off forty hours along with their day" (*μετροῦσι σὺν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ*), i. e. they fast the day which they celebrate as the passover, or the day of Christ's death (for in this there was a difference), and begin with the hour of the death (three o'clock afternoon), a new forty-hours fast till the resurrection.—cf. Jo. Dallaeus de jejuniis et quadragesima. Daventr. 1654, 8.

[34] The older historians, in taking the passover as the festival of the resurrection, misunderstood the celebration practised in Asia Minor. Different opinions of the moderns: Gabr. Daniel de la discipline des Quartodécimans pour la célébration de la Pacque (in his Recueil de divers ouvrages philos., theolog., histor. Paris 1724, 4, iii. 473). Chr. A. Heumann vera descriptio priscae contentionis inter Romam et Asiam de Vero Paschate (in ejusd. nova sylloge dissertat. i. 156 ss). J. L. Mosheim de reb. Christ. ante Const. M. p. 435 ss. Neander im kirchenhist. Archiv. 1823, Heft 2, S. 90 ff. Kirchengesch. i. i. 511 ff. J. W. Rettberg's Paschastreit der älten Kirche, in Illgen's Zeitschr. f. d. hist. Theol. ii. ii. 91. (Comp. my remarks in the theol. Studien u. Krit. 1833, iv. 1149).

[35] The most important in this festival was the passover day, the 14th of Nisan, which, after it had been probably spent in fasting, closed with a Christian paschal meal, (love-feast and Eucharist). (Epiphan. haer. l. 1, *ἄπαξ τοῦ ἔτους μίαν ἡμέραν τοῦ Πάσχα φιλονείκως ἄγουσι.* Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, who defended, in the year 196, this solemnity against the Romish bishop Victor, designates it in Euseb. v. 24, as a *τηρεῖν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτης τοῦ Πάσχα κατὰ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον.* The whole day, therefore, was kept, but it might be observed merely by fasting. Comp. Tertull. de orat. c. 14, see above note 33). In favour of this they appealed to a passage of the law, (Epiphan. haer. l. 1): *ὅτι ἐπικατάρατος, ὃς οὐ ποιήσει τὸ Πάσχα τῇ τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ μηνός.* They said (apud Hippolytus in chron. Pasch. p. 6): *ἐποίησε τὸ Πάσχα ὁ Χριστὸς τότε τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἔπαθεν· διὸ κἀμὲ δεῖ ὃν τρόπον ὁ κύριους ἐποίησεν, οὕτω ποιεῖν.* In it they ate unleavened bread, probably like the Jews, eight days throughout; they said (Chrysostomus contra Jud. orat. iii. ed. Montfaucon i. 610): *ὅτι μετὰ τοῦ ἀζύμου τὸ Πάσχα ἐστίν.* On the contrary, there is no trace of a yearly festival of the resurrection among them, for this was kept every Sunday.

recollection of the death and resurrection of Christ, as in every week, so with greater solemnity every year, at the passover festival, on the corresponding days of the week, so that the passover Friday was always regarded by them as *dies paschae*. When *Polycarp* visited Rome, about 160, he had a conference on this point with the Romish bishop *Anicetus* (*epist. Iren. ap. Euseb.* v. 24). Both remained of the same opinion as before, but separated in perfect friendship. Among the Christians of Asia Minor themselves, there was a controversy in Laodicea respecting the passover, about 170; but the proper point debated is not certainly known.[36]

Since the Christians of Asia Minor appealed in favour of their passover solemnity on the 14th Nisan to John, (Polycrates l. c.), and yet, according to his gospel, Christ partook of the last supper with his disciples so early as the 13th Nisan; an argument has been lately deduced from this fact against the authenticity of John's gospel, (Bretschneider probabilia, p. 109, after him Strauss and Schwegler). To judge correctly of this matter, we must set out with that which is remarked very truly respecting it by Socrates hist. eccl. v. 22: οὐδαμοῦ τοίνυν ὁ Ἀπόστολος, οὐδὲ τὰ εὐαγγέλια ζυγὸν δουλείας τοῖς τῷ κηρύγματι προσελθοῦσιν ἐπέθηκαν· ἀλλὰ τὴν ἑορτὴν τοῦ πάσχα καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἑορτὰς τιμᾷν, τῇ εὐγνωμοσύνῃ τῶν εὐεργετηθέντων κατέλιπον.—σκοπὸς μὴν οὖν γέγονε τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις, οὐ περὶ ἡμερῶν ἑορταστικῶν νομοθετεῖν, ἀλλὰ βίον ὀρθὸν καὶ τὴν θεοσέβειαν εἰσηγήσασθαι· ἐμοὶ δὲ φαίνεται, ὅτι ὥσπερ ἄλλα πολλὰ κατὰ χώρας συνήθειαν ἔλαβεν, οὕτω καὶ ἡ τοῦ πάσχα ἑορτὴ παρ' ἑκάστοις ἐκ συνηθείας τινὸς ἰδιάζουσαν ἔσχε τὴν παρατήρησιν, διὰ τὸ μηδένα τῶν Ἀποστόλων, ὡς ἔφην, μηδέν νενομοθετηκέναι περὶ αὐτῆς. In the Christian assemblies the Jewish passover was at first kept up, but observed with reference to Christ, the true passover, (1 Cor. v. 7, 8). Thus John, too, found it in Ephesus, and allowed it to remain unaltered. He corrected it in his gospel only so far as it proceeded on the supposition that Christ had eaten with the Jews the passover on the day before his death, by making it apparent that Christ was crucified on the 14th Nisan. But that solemnity needed not to have been changed on this account; on the contrary, if the 14th Nisan was the true Christian passover day, the fulfilment of the typical pasch took place on the same day with it.

[36] Melito περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα ap. Eusebius iv. 26, 2: ἐπὶ Σερουΐλιου Παύλου, ἀνθυπάτου τῆς Ἀσίας, ᾧ Σάγαρις καιρῷ ἐμαρτύρησεν, ἐγένετο ζήτησις πολλὴ ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα, ἐμπεσόντος κατὰ καιρὸν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις· καὶ ἐγράφη ταῦτα. Eusebius adds, that Clement of Alexandria was induced to write his book on the passover by this work of Melito. Since Melito is quoted by Polycrates (Euseb. v. 24, 2) as an authority for the custom observed in Asia Minor, but since the paschal chronicle, p. 6 s., quotes the writings of the contemporaneous Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis, and Clement of Alexandria, on the passover, beside each other in favour of the view that Christ had not eaten the Jewish passover on the day before his death, it has been inferred that Apollinaris had attacked

Public sinners were excluded from the church, and the way for restoration could only be prepared by public repentance.[37] A public repentance was generally allowed only after baptism.[38] In the African church they proceeded so far as frequently to exclude for ever those who had been guilty of incontinence, murder, and idolatry. This was done in pursuance of Montanist principles.[39]

the Asiatic practice, and that Melito defended it. But no trace of this is found in Eusebius; on the contrary, both writers are named by him beside one another as working together harmoniously, (iv. 26). In the fragments of Apollinaris's work which remain, those persons are combated who said: ὅτι τῇ ιδ' τὸ πρόβατον μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν ἔφαγεν ὁ Κύριος, τῇ δὲ μεγάλῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων αὐτὸς ἔπαθεν, and appealed to Matthew in their favour. This view, says Apollinaris, contradicts the law (so far as the passover, and consequently also Christ as the passover, must be offered the 14th) and the gospels, and he asserts in opposition to it: ἡ ιδ' τὸ ἀληθινὸν τοῦ Κυρίου Πάσχα, ἡ θυσία ἡ μεγάλη, ὁ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀμνοῦ παῖς θεοῦ κ. τ. λ. Hence he does not commit the keeping of the 14th as the paschal day, but merely intends to vindicate the right significance of it against erroneous conceptions. This day was to be celebrated as the Christian passover, not because Christ had eaten on it the typical passover with the Jews, but because he himself, as the true passover, had offered himself to God.

[37] ἐξομολόγησις. Iren. i. c. 9 of a female penitent: αὐτὴ τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον ἐξομολογουμένη διετέλεσε πενθοῦσα καὶ θρηνοῦσα. Tertull. de poenit. c. 9: Exomologesis —, qua delictum Domino nostrum confitemur: non quidem ut ignaro, sed quatenus satisfactio confessione disponitur, confessione poenitentia nascitur, poenitentia Deus mitigatur. Itaque exomologesis prosternendi et humilificandi hominis disciplina est, conversationem injungens misericordiae illicem. De ipso quoque habitu atque victu mandat, sacco et cineri incubare, corpus sordibus obscurare, animum moeroribus dejicere; illa, quae peccavit, tristi tractatione mutare. Caeterum pastum et potum pura nosse; non ventris scilicet, sed animae causa. Plerumque vero jejuniis preces alere, ingemiscere, lachrymari, et mugire dies noctesque ad dominum Deum tuum, presbyteris advolvi, et caris Dei adgeniculari, omnibus fratribus legationes deprecationis suae injungere.—Inquantum non peperceris tibi, intantum tibi Deus, crede, parcet.

[38] Hermae Pastor ii. Mand. 4, § 1. Servis enim Dei poenitentia una est. (Cf. Cotelerius ad h. l.) Then he softens, § 3, the principle afterwards asserted by the Montanists, quod alia poenitentia non est nisi illa, cum in aquam descendimus, et accipimus remissionem peccatorum, so far: quod post vocationem illam magnam et sanctam, si quis tentatus fuerit a Diabolo, et peccaverit, unam poenitentiam habet. So too Clemens Alex. strom. ii. c. 13, p. 459 s. Cf. Bingham, lib. xviii. c. 4, vol. viii. p. 156 ss.

[39] Tertull. de pudic. c. 12, appeals in favour of this to Acts xv. 29. Cyprian. Epist. 52: Apud antecessores nostros quidam de Episcopis istic

Those persons were highly honoured, who endured persecutions for the sake of the Christian faith. The death of *a martyr* (μάρτυς, Acts xxii. 20; Heb. xii. 1; Apoc. xvii. 6) was supposed, like baptism, to have the efficacy of destroying sin (lavacrum sanguinis, τὸ βάπτισμα διὰ πυρός, Luke xii. 50; Mark x. 39), supplied the place even of baptism (according to Matthew x. 39), and introduced the person immediately to the presence of the Lord in paradise (Matt. v. 10—12; Apoc. vi. 9: hence ἡμέρα γενέθλιος, γενέθλια τῶν μαρτύρων, natales, natalitia martyrum).[40] But the surviving *confessors* also (ὁμολογήται, confessores, Matt. x. 32; 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13) were held to be chosen members of Christ. People were zealous in visiting them in the prisons, and taking care of them;[41] and this was enjoined on the deacons as a pecu-

in provincia nostra dandam pacem moechis non putaverunt, et in totum poenitentiae locum contra adulteria clauserunt. Non tamen a Coëpiscoporum suorum collegio recesserunt, aut catholicae Ecclesiae unitatem vel duritiae vel censurae suae obstinatione ruperunt; ut, quia apud alios adulteris pax dabatur, qui non dabat, de ecclesia separaretur. Manente concordiae vinculo et perseverante Catholicae Ecclesiae individuo sacramento, actum suum disponit et dirigit unusquisque Episcopus, rationem propositi sui Domino redditurus. Though this severity was afterwards relaxed in reference to Moechi (see below § 59, note 4), yet they still remained, as at first, united with the Montanists in asserting this principle, Tertull. de pudic. c. 12, quod neque idololatriae neque sanguini pax ab Ecclesiis redditur.

[40] Hermas (Pastor. iii., Simil. ix. 28) says to the martyrs: Vitam vobis donat Dominus, nec intelligitis. Delicta enim vestra vos gravabant: et nisi passi essetis hujus nominis causa, propter peccata certe vestra mortui eratis Deo. Tertull. de resurr. carnis 43: Nemo enim peregrinatus a corpore statim immoratur penes Dominum, nisi ex martyrii praerogativa, scilicet paradiso, non inferis diversurus. (In like manner, according to the ancient Greeks, only heroes attained to the Ἠλύσιον or the μακάρων νῆσοι, of whose situation similar ideas were entertained as of Paradise, see Dissen de fortunatorum insulis disp. Gotting. 1837. On Paradise see Uhlemann in Illgen's Zeitschr, f. d. hist. Theol. i. i. 146.) Clemens Alex. strom. iv. p. 596. Ἔοικεν οὖν τὸ μαρτύριον ἀποκάθαρσις εἶναι ἁμαρτιῶν μετὰ δόξης.

[41] Tertull. ad martyres c. 1 init.: Inter carnis alimenta, benedicti martyres designati, quae vobis et domina mater ecclesia de uberibus suis, et singuli fratres de opibus suis propriis in carcerem subministrant, capite aliquid et a nobis, quod faciat ad spiritum quoque educandum. Carnem enim saginari et spiritum esurire non prodest. The excess of duty which he here only refers to (cf. Lucian. de morte Peregrini c. 12), he afterwards censured with bitterness in the Psychics, de jejunio c. 12: Plane vestrum est in carceribus popinas exhibere martyribus incertis, ne

liar duty.[42] If the lapsed (lapsi)[43] had been admitted by them to communion, there was a general aversion any longer to refuse them restoration to the privileges of the church.[44] As it was an important point in the estimation of Christians generally to keep up the consciousness of enduring communion with their departed, this communion, accordingly, with the blessed martyrs, was especially valuable and dear to them. In this sense, families celebrated the remembrance of their departed members,[45] churches that of their martyrs yearly on the day of their death,[46]

consuetudinem quaerant, ne taedeat vitae, ne nova abstinentiae disciplina scandalizentur. He even accuses them of endeavouring to put courage into the prisoners before their trial, condito mero tanquam antidoto.

[42] Cypriani Ep. 11: semper sub antecessoribus nostris factum est, ut Diaconi ad carcerem commeantes Martyrum desideria consiliis suis et scripturarum praeceptis gubernarent. So Perpetua relates in the Passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis c. 3: Ibi tunc Tertius et Pomponius, benedicti Diaconi, qui nobis ministrabant, constituerunt praemio, ut paucis horis emissi in meliorem locum carceris refrigeraremus.

[43] In opposition to the stantes, as Romans xiv. 4. 1 Cor. x. 12.

[44] Epist. Eccl. Vienn. et Ludg. ap. Euseb. v. 2, § 3. Tertull. ad Mart. c. 1: Quam pacem quidam in ecclesia non habentes a martyribus in carcere exorare consueverunt. Idem de pudicitia c. 22: Ut quisque ex consensione vincula induit adhuc mollia, in novo custodiae nomine statim ambiunt moechi, statim adeunt fornicatores, jam preces circumsonant, jam lacrymae circumstagnant maculati cujusque, nec ulli magis aditum carceris redimunt, quam qui Ecclesiam perdiderunt.

[45] Tertull. de exhort. cast. c. 11, to the man who had married a second time: Neque enim pristinam poteris odisse, cui etiam religiosiorem reservas affectionem, ut jam receptae apud Deum, pro cujus spiritu postulas, pro qua oblationes annuas reddis. Stabis ergo ad Deum cum tot uxoribus, quot in oratione commemoras, et offeres pro duabus, et commendabis illas duas. De monogamia c. 10: Enimvero et pro anima ejus (mariti mortui) orat (uxor), et refrigerium interim adpostulat ei, et in prima resurrectione consortium, et offert annuis diebus dormitionis ejus.

[46] Epist. Eccl. Smyrn. de martyr. Polyc. ap. Euseb. iv. 15, 15: *Χριστὸν μὲν γὰρ υἱὸν ὄντα τοῦ θεοῦ προσκυνοῦμεν· τοὺς δὲ μάρτυρας ὡς μαθητὰς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ μιμητὰς ἀγαπῶμεν ἀξίως, ἕνεκα εὐνοίας ἀνυπερβλήτου τῆς εἰς τὸν ἴδιον βασιλέα καὶ διδάσκαλον, ὧν γένοιτο καὶ ἡμᾶς συγκοινωνούς τε καὶ συμμαθητὰς γενέσθαι.*—*οὕτως τε ἡμεῖς ὕστερον ἀνελόμενοι τὰ τιμιώτερα λίθων πολυτελῶν καὶ δοκιμώτερα ὑπὲρ χρυσίον ὀστᾶ αὐτοῦ* (Πολυκάρπου), *ἀπεθέμεθα ὅπου καὶ ἀκόλουθον ἦν. ἔνθα ὡς δυνατὸν ἡμῖν συναγομένοις ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει καὶ χαρᾷ, παρέξει ὁ κύριος ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου αὐτοῦ ἡμέραν γενέθλιον, εἵς τε τῶν προηθληκότων μνήμην, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἄσκησίν τε καὶ ἑτοιμασίαν.* Tert. de corona mil. 3: oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis annua die facimus. Cyprian. epist. 34: Sacrificia pro eis (martyribus) semper, ut

by prayers at the graves,[47] and by agapae. So high an estimation of martyrdom induced many Christians to give themselves up to the authorities, thus furnishing cause for the charge of fanatical enthusiasm brought against them by the heathen.[48]

meministis, offerimus, quoties martyrum passiones et dies anniversaria commemoratione celebramus. Comp. Cyprian's instructions to his clergy how they should take care of the confessors. Epist. 37: officium meum vestra diligentia repraesentet, faciat omnia quae fieri oportet circa eos, quos in talibus meritis fidei ac virtutis illustravit divina dignatio. Denique et dies eorum quibus excedunt annotate, ut commemorationes eorum inter memorias Martyrum celebrare possimus—et celebrentur hic a nobis oblationes et sacrificia ob commemorationes eorum quae cito vobiscum Domino protegente celebrabimus. Further notices of the martyrs were the affairs of private individuals; and the representation of Anastasius (liber Pontificalis in vita Clementis) originated in the respect paid to saints in later times. Hic fecit vii. regiones dividi Notariis fidelibus Ecclesiae, qui gesta Martyrum sollicite et curiose, unusquisque per regionem suam, perquirerent (cf. vitae Anteri and Fabiani), which was afterwards copied into martyrologies. How few genuine histories of the martyrs may be expected from this age is evident from Augustini sermo xciii. de diversis: Hoc primum primi Martyris (Stephani) meritum commendatum est charitati vestrae: quia, cum aliorum Martyrum vix gesta inveniamus, quae in solemnitatibus eorum recitare possimus, hujus passio in canonico libro est. Gregorius M. lib. viii. ep. 29, ad Eulogiam Episc. Alex.: Praeter illa quae in Eusebii libris de gestis SS. Martyrum continentur, nulla in archivo hujus nostrae Ecclesiae, vel in Romanae urbis bibliothecis esse cognovi, nisi pauca quaedam in unius codicis volumine collecta. Nos autem paene omnium martyrum, distinctis per dies singulos passionibus, collecta in uno codice nomina habemus, atque quotidianis diebus in eorum veneratione missarum solemnia agimus. Non tamen in eodem volumine, quis qualiter sit passus indicatur, sed tantummodo nomen, locus, et dies passionis ponitur. The cause of this may not indeed have been that assigned by Prudentius περὶ στεφάνων i. v. 75:

> Chartulas blasphemus olim nam satelles abstulit,
> Ne tenacibus libellis erudita saecula
> Ordinem, tempus, modumque passionis proditum,
> Dulcibus linguis per aures posterorum spargerent.

Cf. Casp. Sagittarius de natalitiis martyrum in primitiva ecclesia. Jen. 1678, auctius ed. J. A. Schmid. 1696. 4.

[47] Hence the cry of the heathen: Areae non sint. s. Tertull. ad Scapul. c. 3.

[48] Tertull. ad Scapulam c. 5. Arrius Antoninus (at the time of Hadrian) in Asia cum persequeretur instanter, omnes illius civitatis Christiani ante tribunalia ejus se manu facta obtulerunt, cum ille, paucis duci jussis, reliquis ait: ὦ ὀειλοί, εἰ θέλετε ἀποθνήσκειν, κρημνοῖς ἢ βρόχοις ἔχετε. In like manner Justin makes the heathen say to the Christians, Apol. ii. 4: Πάντες οὖν ἑαυτοὺς φωνεύσαντες πορεύεσθε ἤδη παρὰ τὸν θεὸν, καὶ ἡμῖν

This mode of proceeding, however, was for the most part discountenanced, in consequence of the express command of Christ (Matt. x. 23).[49]

πράγματα μὴ παρέχετε. Afterwards the Montanists especially, see Tertull. l. c. de fuga in persec. &c. Cf. S. F. Rivini diss. de professoribus veteris Ecclesiae martyribus. Lips. 1739. 4.

[49] Epist. Eccl. Smyrn. c. 4: οὐκ ἐπαινοῦμεν τοὺς προσιόντας ἑαυτοῖς, ἐπειδὴ οὐχ οὕτως διδάσκει τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. (Eusebius, an admirer of such transactions, has omitted this sentence.) Clemens Alex. strom. iv. p. 597, vii. p. 871 ed. Potter.

THIRD DIVISION.

FROM SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS TO THE SOLE DOMINION OF CONSTANTINE. A.D. 193–324.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 54.

CONDITION OF HEATHENISM.

While the Roman empire appeared hastening to its fall, the throne being occupied by soldiers, the provinces devastated by barbarians, and the government changed into the most arbitrary despotism, the kingdom of superstition, in which alone the men of that time sought for peace and security from the dangers that surrounded them, had established itself firmly. Not only were the emperors themselves addicted to this superstition, but they also openly confessed it, and partly introduced themselves foreign rites into Rome.[1] The Platonic philosophy, which had confined itself till now to a defence of the popular religions, and to securing for the wise a more elevated worship of deity, endeavoured, since the beginning of the third century, to give to the people's religion a higher and more spiritual form, under the appearance of bringing it back to its original, purer state. This philosophy had been unquestionably overpowered by the spiritual predominance of Christianity. With this view, *Philostratus*

[1] P. E. Müller de hierarchia et studio vitae asceticae in sacris et mysteriis Graec. et Rom. latentibus. Hafn. 1803. Abschn. 3 (translated in the N. Bibl. d. schön. Wissensch. Bd. 70. S. 3 ff.) The Jewish religion also was continually incorporated into this religious mixture (comp. above § 17, note 9), see Commodiani (about 270) instructiones adv. gentium deos pro christiana disciplina (in Gallandii biblioth. vett. Patr. T. iii.):

> Inter utrumque putans dubie vivendo cavere,
> Nudatus a lege decrepitus luxu procedis?
> Quid in synagoga decurris ad Pharisaeos,
> Ut tibi misericors fiat, quem denegas ultro?
> Exis inde foris, iterum tu fana requiris.

the elder composed the life of *Apollonius* of Tyana (220), in which the latter was represented as the reformer of heathenism.[2] But all the preceding tendencies of philosophy, and this also, were perfected in the so-called *new platonic* school.[3] The founder of it, *Ammonius Saccas*, Σακκᾶς (*i. e.* σακκοφόρος) of Alexandria († about 243), an apostate from Christianity to heathenism,[4] appears to have borrowed the pattern of his heathenism-defending philosophy principally from the Christian gnostics. He communicated his system only as a secret; but by his disciple, the Egyptian *Plotinus* († 270), it was farther developed, and spread abroad with incredible rapidity. With no less renown, Plotinus was followed by his disciple, *Porphyry* of Tyre (*Malchus* † 304), and he by *Jamblichus* of Chalcis († 333), who survived the overthrow of paganism.[5]

The leading principles of the theology of these philosophers, who wished to find the absolute, not by a process of thought, but by immediate intuition, like the Christian gnostics, are the following: From the highest existence (τὸ ἕν) arises intelligence (ὁ νοῦς), and from this the soul (ἡ ψυχή). The highest world of intelligence or understanding (κόσμος νοητός), is the essence of all intelligences, of the gods as well as of human spirits. By the soul of the world (consequently the δημιουργός), the visible world was formed. The gods are divided into *those dwelling above the*

[2] Comp. § 14, note 10, and Baur's treatise there quoted. Tzschirner's Fall. d. Heidenthums i. 405, 461.

[3] Concerning this comp. Tiedemann's Geist der specul. Philosoph. iii. 262. Tennemann's Gesch. d. Philos. vi. Ritter's Gesch. d. Philos. iv. 535. C. Meiner's Beitrag zur Gesch. d. Denkart d. ersten Jahrh. n. Chr. G. Leipzig 1782, 8, S. 47 ff. Imm. Fichte de philosophiae novae Platonicae origine. Berol. 1818. F. Bouterwek Philosophorum Alexandrinorum ac Neo-Platonicorum recensio accuratior in the Commentatt. Soc. Reg. Scient. Gotting. recentiores vol. v. (1823) p. 227 ss. Tzschirner's Fall. d. Heidenth. i. S. 404 ff. K. Vogt's Neoplatonismus u. Christenthum. Th. i. Neoplatonische Lehre. Berlin 1836, 8.

[4] Porphyrius contra Christianos ap Euseb. vi. 19: Ἀμμώνιος μὲν γὰρ Χριστιανὸς ἐν Χριστιανοῖς ἀνατραφεὶς τοῖς γονεῦσιν, ὅτε τοῦ φρονεῖν καὶ τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἥψατο, εὐθὺς πρὸς τὴν κατὰ νόμους πολιτείαν μετεβάλετο. On the other hand, Eusebius: τῷ Ἀμμωνίῳ τὰ τῆς ἐνθέου φιλοσοφίας ἀκέραια καὶ ἀδιάπτωτα καὶ μέχρις ἐσχάτης τοῦ βίου διέμενε τελευτῆς. Here Eusebius evidently refers to another Ammonius, probably to the author of the gospel harmony.

[5] Vita Plotini by Porphyrius in Fabric. Bibl. Gr., vol. iv. Eunapii (about 395) vitae Sophistarum. rec. et illustr. J. F. Boissonade. Amst. 1822. 8.

world (ἄϋλοι, νοητοί, ἀφανεῖς), and *those inhabiting the world* (περικόσμιοι, αἰσθητοί, ἐμφανεῖς). To the latter the different parts of the world are entrusted for oversight (hence θεοὶ μερικοί, μέριστοι, ἔνάρχαι, πολιοῦχοι); and from them the various nations have derived their peculiar character. Lower than the gods stand the *demons*, some good, and others bad. While the people worship the highest god only in their national deities, and that with propriety, the wise man must, on the contrary, endeavour to attain to immediate union with the highest deity. While neoplatonism endeavoured in this way both to prop up heathenism, and to give it a higher and more spiritual character, it adapted itself, on the one hand, to the grossest popular superstitions, and, on the other, adopted the purest ideas respecting the supreme deity.. Accordingly, it communicated, at the same time, the most excellent precepts regarding the moral worship of God, and recommended asceticism and theurgy,[6] in order to elevate its votaries to communion with the deity, and to obtain dominion over the demons. It cannot well be doubted, that Christianity influenced the development of the purer aspect of the neo-platonic doctrines, when we look at the striking agreement of many of these doctrines with those of Christianity.[7] This source, however, was not acknowledged by the new Platonists, who wished that the root of their doctrine should be considered as existing only in the national philosophy, and, along with it, in the oldest Chaldean and Egyptian wisdom. In consequence of this view, neo-platonic productions appeared sometimes in the form of *Chaldean oracles*,[8] and in the name of *Hermes Trismegistus*.[9]

[6] Lobeck Aglaophamus i. p. 104 ss.

[7] Mosheim diss. de studio ethnicorum Christianos imitandi in his Diss. ad hist. eccl. pertinentes i. 351. Ullmann über den Einfluss des Christenth. auf Porphyrius, in the theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1832, ii. 376.

[8] Respecting the Χαλδαϊκὰ λόγια among the New Platonists, see J. C. Thilo comm. de coelo empyreo. pp. iii. Halae 1839, 40. 4.

[9] Hermes Trismegistus was the concentration of the old Egyptian wisdom, in whose name works of very different kinds were composed. The philosophic portion of them belongs to the New Platonism: Asclepius and Poemander are the most important (Opp. gr. lat. ed. Adr. Turnebus. Paris 1554. 4. Colon. 1630. fol. Hermes Trismegists Poemander von D. Tiedemann. Berlin 1781). Even in them we find many ideas borrowed from Christianity, so that they are erroneously, in part, attributed to Christian authors. Comp. Casauboni exercitatt. ad Baronium p. 69. Chr. Meiner's Religionsgeschich. d. aeltesten Voelker, bes.

FIRST CHAPTER.

EXTERNAL FORTUNES OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 55.

DISPOSITION OF THE HEATHEN TOWARD IT.

Though the reports of secret abominations said to be practised by the Christians in their assemblies vanished by degrees among the *heathen people*,[1] yet other prejudices against them remained unchanged. Every public calamity was continually regarded as a token of the wrath of the gods against the Christians, and excited afresh hatred and persecution.[2] The *cultivated heathen* held fast by the old view, that whatever truth they could not avoid perceiving in the Christian religion, was disfigured by a barbarous form, and the admixture of rude enthusiasm, and was found in a purer form in their national traditions. From this point of view began, since the commencement of the third century, the efforts which were made to reform the popular religion, that it might be elevated to the same height as Christianity. In this way both religions had either to be blended together, or greater power given to heathenism to withstand Christianity. *Philostratus*, in his life of Apollonius of Tyana, might have had in

d. Aegyptier. Göttingen 1775. S. 202. Tennemann's Gesch. d. Philos. vi. 464. Baumgarten-Crusius de librorum Hermeticorum origine atque indole (a Jena easter-programm), 1827. 4to.

[1] Origenes c. Cels. vi. p. 294: ἤτις δυσφημία παραλόγως πάλαι μὲν πλείστων ὅσων ἐκράτει,—καὶ νῦν δὲ ἔτι ἀπατᾷ τινας. Eusebius iv. 7, 5: οὐκ εἰς μακρόν γε μὴν αὐτῷ (δαίμονι) ταῦτα προύχώρει.

[2] Comp. above § 41, note 26. The constant reproach of the heathen may be found in Cyprianus lib. ad Demetrianum: Dixisti, per nos fieri, et quod nobis debeant imputari omnia ista, quibus nunc mundus quatitur et urgetur, quod dii vestri a nobis non colantur. Origenes in Matth. commentariorum series c. 39 (on Matth. xxiv. 9), Arnobius adv. gentes i. c. 1: postquam esse in mundo christiana gens coepit, terrarum orbem periisse, multiformibus malis affectum esse genus humanum: ipsos etiam Coelites derelictis curis solennibus, quibus quondam solebant invisere res nostras, terrarum ab regionibus exterminatos, c. 3, iii. 36, iv. 47. cf. Maximini epist. ap. Euseb. ix. 7, 4.

view this *syncretitisc* object,[3] but Neo-platonism on the contrary appeared in an attitude decidedly hostile to Christianity.[4] The new Platonists for the most part regarded Christ as the most distinguished being and theurgist. On the other hand, however, they asserted that the doctrine of Christ perfectly agreed with theirs at first, but that it had been in many ways corrupted by his disciples, especially by the doctrine of Christ's deity, and forbidding the worship of the gods.[5] In this manner the Christians

[3] Comp. § 14, Not. 10. Baur's Apollonius u. Christus, in the Tübingen Zeitschr. f. Theol. 1832, iv. 123 ff.

[4] Mosheim de turbata per recentiores Platonicos ecclesia in his dissert. ad hist. eccl. pert. i. 120, 173. Keil de causis alieni Platonic. recent. a rel. Christ. animi (Opusc. acad. ii. 393 ss.). Tzschirner's Fall d. Heidenth. i. 560.

[5] Porphyrius περὶ τῆς ἐκ λογίων φιλοσοφίας (a book which Ficinus must have read even so late as the fifteenth century. See his Comment. in Plotini Ennead. ii. lib. iii. c. 7, p. 121, and frequently, and which is probably still preserved in some Florentine library) apud Augustin. de Civ. Dei xix. 23: Praeter opinionem profecto quibusdam videatur esse quod dicturi sumus. Christum enim Dii piissimum pronunciaverunt et immortalem factum, et cum bona praedicatione ejus meminerunt (namely by oracles). Christianos autem pollutos et contaminatos et errore implicatos esse dicunt, et multis talibus adversus eos blasphemiis utuntur.—De Christo autem interrogantibus si est Deus, ait Hecate: "Quoniam quidem immortalis anima post corpus ut incedit, nosti: a sapientia autem abscissa semper errat: viri pietate praestantissimi est illa anima, hanc colunt aliena a se veritate." The same in Euseb. demonstr. evang. iii. c. 8:—

Ὅστι μὲν ἀθανάτη ψυχὴ μετὰ σῶμα προβαίνει,
Γιγνώσκει σοφίῃ τετιμημένος. ἀλλάγε ψυχὴ
Ἀνέρος εὐσεβίῃ προφερεστάτη ἐστὶν ἐκείνου.

Sunt spiritus terreni minimi loco terreno quodam malorum Daemonum potestati subjecti. Ab his sapientes Hebraeorum, quorum unus iste etiam Jesus fuit, sicut audisti divina Apollinis oracula, quae superius dicta sunt: ab his ergo Hebraei Daemonibus pessimis et minoribus spiritibus vetabant religiosos, et ipsis vacare prohibebant: venerari autem magis coelestes Deos, amplius autem venerari Deum patrem. Hoc autem et Dii praecipiunt, et in superioribus ostendimus, quemadmodum animadvertere ad Deum monent, et illum colere ubique imperant. Verum indocti et impiae naturae, quibus vere fatum non concessit a Diis dona obtinere, neque habere Jovis immortalis notionem, non audientes et Deos et divinos viros, Deos quidem omnes recusaverunt, prohibitos autem Daemones non solum nullis odiis inseque, sed etiam revereri delegerunt. Augustin. de consensu Evangelistar. lib. i. c. 7, § 11. Honorandum enim tamquam sapientissimum virum putant, colendum autem tamquam Deum negant. Ibid. c. 9, § 14: Ita vero isti desipiunt, ut illis libris, quos eum (Christum) scripsisse existimant, dicant contineri eas artes, quibus eum putant illa fecisse miracula, quorum fama ubique precrebuit: quod existimando se ipsis produnt, quid diligant, et quid affectent. Ibid.

appeared to be a crowd of misguided enthusiasts who had strayed from their leader, in opposition to whom, the heathen in their philosophy, and in their purified popular worship, possessed the purer truth, and occupied a higher position. The contest of these philosophers with Christianity, which continued till the sixth century, had thus a more earnest character than the earlier attacks. In the works of *Plotinus* many passages are aimed at the Christians, without their name being introduced.[6] Direct attacks against them were the κατὰ Χριστιανῶν λογοί, fifteen books of *Porphyry*;[7] and the λόγοι φιλαλήθεις πρὸς Χριστιανούς in two books of *Hierocles*, governor of Bithynia under Diocletian.[8] The lives also of Pythagoras by *Jamblichus* and *Porphyry*, had a hostile reference to Christianity.[9]

e. 15: vani Christi laudatores et christianae religionis obliqui obtrectatores—continent blasphemias a Christo, et eas in discipulos ejus effundunt. Ibid. c. 34: Ita enim volunt et ipsum credi, nescio quid aliud scripsisse, quod diligunt, nihilque sensisse contra Deos suos, sed eos potius magico ritu coluisse, et discipulos ejus non solum de illo fuisse mentitos, dicendo illum Deum, per quem facta sint omnia, cum aliud nihil quam homo fuerit, quamvis excellentissimae sapentiae: verum etiam de Diis eorum non hoc docuisse, quod ab illo didicissent.

Vogt's Neoplatonismus u. Christenthum, S. 137 ff.

[7] Whether he was an apostate from Christianity, as Socrates iii. 23, Augustin de civit. Dei x. 28, say, is questionable. See the correspondence between Siberus and Thomas in Miscellan. Lips. tom. i. p. 331 ss. Ullmann in the theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1832, ii. 380.—Fragments of his writings have been collected by Luc. Holstenius diss. de vita et scriptis Porphyrii. Rom. 1630, 8 (reprinted in Fabricii Bibl. gr. t. iv. p. 207 ss.). The works written against him by Methodius, bishop of Tyre, Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, and (the best) by Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea, have also been lost.

[8] Cf. Lactant. institutt. div. v. c. 2 and 3. Against his comparison of Christ with Apollonius of Tyana see Eusebius contra Hierocl. lib. appended to his Demonstratio Evangelica. ed. Paris 1628, and Colon. 1688. Baur's Apollonius von Tyana und Christus, S 1. Even in Chrysostom's time, the writings of the heathen philosophers against Christianity were for the most part lost (Chrys. de S. Babyl. Opp. ed. Montf. ii. 539). According to a law of Valentinian III. and Theodosius II., A.D. 449, they were enjoined to be burnt (Cod. Justin. i. 1, 3).

[9] Jamblichus de vita Pythagorae gr. et lat. ed. Theoph. Kiessling. Acc. Porphyrius de vita Pyth. 2 Partes. Lips. 1815, 16, 8. Comp. Mosheim dissertt. ad hist. eccl. pert. i. 151. Tzschirner's Fall. d. Heidenth. i. 465. Baur's Apollonius, S. 208.

§ 56.

CONDUCT OF THE EMPERORS TOWARDS THE CHRISTIANS.

After Christianity had been favourably regarded by several emperors in the first half of this period, and had been introduced into the general religious syncretism, there arose in the second half, not only new persecutions, but such as partook of a far more hazardous character than any of the earlier, since they were generally commanded by the emperors, and aimed at nothing less than the complete annihilation of Christianity. *Septimius Severus* (193 till 211), was indeed not unfriendly to the Christians at first, *(Tertull. ad. Scapulam, c.* 4); but they had much to suffer in the provinces from the popular rage[1] and the avarice of the governors.[2] These persecutions increased considerably after the emperor (203), changed perhaps by the excesses of the Montanists, had forbidden the adoption of Christianity.[3] Under *Caracalla*, however, (211—217), they gradually ceased.[4]

[1] Tertullian. de fuga in persecut. c. 12: persecutionem—non esse—redemptio nummaria fuga est.

[2] Tertull. apologet. (written 198) c. 7, 12, 30, 37, 49. cf. Mosheim de aetate apologet. Tertull. et initio persecut. Christ. sub Severo (dissertt. ad hist. eccl. pert. vol. i. p. 1 ss.).

[3] Cf. Tertull. de corona militis.—Spartian. in Severo c. 17: In itinere Palaestinis plurima jura fundavit. Judaeos fieri sub gravi poena vetuit. Idem etiam de Christianis sanxit. Ulpianus in lib. sing. de officio Praefecti Urbi (Dig. lib. i. tit. 12, § 14): Divus Severus rescripsit, eos etiam, qui illicitum collegium coisse dicuntur, apud Praefectum Urbis accusandos. Euseb. vi. 7. (Ἰούδας συγγραφέων ἕτερος) τὴν Ζεφυλλουμένην τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου παρουσίαν ἤδη τότε πλησιάζειν ᾤετο· οὕτω σφοδρῶς ἡ τοῦ καθ' ἡμῶν τότε διωγμοῦ κίνησις, τὰς τῶν πολλῶν ἀνετάραττε διανοίας. Martyrs in Alexandria: Leonides (Euseb. vi. 1), Potamiaena (Ibid. c. 5), in Africa: Martyres Scillitani, Perpetua et Felicitas (Acta apud Ruinart and in Münter primord. Eccl. Afr. p. 219 ss. On Severus generally see Münter l. c. p. 172 ss.).

[4] Not in Africa at first, Tertull. ad Scapulam liber.—In this book, c. 4, Caracalla is said to be lacte christiano educatus.—Under this emperor, as appears from Digest. lib. i. tit. 16, l. 4. Domitius Ulpianus wrote his Libb. x. de officio Proconsulis. Cf. Lactant. institutt. v. c. 11: Domitius de officio Proconsulis libro septimo rescripta principum nefaria collegit, ut doceret, quibus poenis affici oporteret eos, qui se cultores Dei confiterentur.

Elagabalus (218—222), went so far as to think of blending the Christian religion with the worship of his god.[5] *Severus Alexander* (222—235), and his mother, Julia Mammaea, were addicted to a similar syncretism, and gave the Christians many proofs of their good-will.[6] On the contrary, *Maximin the Thracian* (235—238), persecuted the Christian clergy, and overlooked the persecutions in which the people of some provinces, excited against the Christians by an earthquake, indulged.[7] After the reign of *Gordian* (238—244), and *Philip the Arabian* (244—249),[8] dur-

[5] Lampridius in Heliogabal. c. 3: Heliogabalum in Palatino monte juxta aedes imperatorias consecravit, eique templum fecit, studens et Matris typum et Vestae ignem et Palladium et ancilia et omnia Romanis veneranda in illud transferre templum, et id agens, ne quis Romae Deus, nisi Heliogabalus coleretur. Dicebat praeterea, Judaeorum et Samaritanorum religiones, et christianam devotionem illuc transferendam, ut omnium culturarum secretum Heliogabali sacerdotium teneret. Baur's Apollonius v. Tyana u. Christus, in the Tübingen Zeitschrift. f. Theol. 1832, iv. 127.

[6] Origen was called by Julia Mammaea to Antioch, Euseb. vi. 21. On this account, later writers (first Orosius vii. 18) make her a Christian.—Lampridius in Sev. Alex. c. 22: Judaeis privilegia reservavit, Christianos esse passus est. c. 28: quodam tempore festo, ut solent, Antiochenses, Aegyptii, Alexandrini lacessiverant eum conviciolis, Syrum Archisynagogum eum vocantes, et Archierea. c. 29: Matutinis horis in larario suo, in quo et divos Principes, sed optimos, electos, et animas sanctiores, in queis et Apollonium, et, quantum scriptor suorum temporum dicit, Christum, Abraham et Orpheum, et hujusmodi caeteros habebat, ac majorum effigies, rem divinam faciebat. c. 43: Christo templum facere voluit, eumque inter Deos recipere, quod et Hadrianus cogitasse fertur: —sed prohibitus est ab iis, qui consulentes sacra repererant omnes Christianos futuros, si id optato evenisset, et templa reliqua deserenda. (On the religious syncretism of the emperor see two dissertations in Heyne opusc. acad. vol. vi. p. 169.) c. 45: Ubi aliquos voluisset vel rectores provinciis dare, vel praepositos facere, vel procuratores, id est rationales ordinare, nomina eorum proponebat, hortans populum, ut si quis quid haberet criminis, probaret manifestus rebus; si non probasset, subiret poenam capitis: dicebatque grave esse, cum ad Christiani et Judaei facerent in praedicandis sacerdotibus, qui ordinandi sunt, non fieri in provinciarum rectoribus, quibus et fortunae hominum committerentur et capita. c. 49: Cum Christiani quendam locum, qui publicus fuerat, occupassent, contra popinarii dicerent, sibi eum deberi, rescripsit, melius esse, ut quomodocunque illic Deus colatur, quam propinariis dedatur.

[7] Eusebius vi. 28, Firmilianus ad Cyprian. (in epp. Cypr. 75) Origenes Commentar. in Matth. xxiv. 9 (tom. 28).

[8] Euseb. hist. eccl. vi. 34, τοῦτον κατέχει λόγος Χριστιανὸν ὄντα ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ὑστάτης τοῦ Πάσχα παννυχίδος τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας εὐχῶν τῷ πλήθει συμμεταστχεῖν ἐθελῆσαι· οὐ πρότερον δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ τηνικάδε προεστῶτος (according

ing which they were unmolested, *Decius*, (249—251), immediately after he had ascended the throne, gave the signal by an edict for a fearful (the first really general) persecution,[9] in which many Christians suffered martyrdom,[10] while many others, enervated by long quietude, apostatised, *(sacrificati, thurificati.—libellatici)*.[11] *Gallus* also (251—253), after a short

to Leontius, bishop of Antioch, about 350, in the Chronic. Pasch. ad Olymp. 257, it was Babylas, bishop of Antioch) ἐπιτραπῆναι εἰσβαλεῖν, ἢ ἐξομολογήσασθαι, καὶ τοῖς ἐν παραπτώμασιν ἐξεταζομένοις, μετανοίας τε χώραν ἴσχουσιν, ἑαυτὸν καταλέξαι'—καὶ πειθαρχῆσαί γε προθύμως λέγεται. Hieron. in Chron. ad ann. 246. Philippus primus omnium ex Romanis imperatoribus Christianus fuit. First contradicted by Jos. Scaliger ad Euseb. Chron. and Is. Casaubonus ad Jul. Capitolin, p. 201, especially Frid. Spanheim de Christianismo Phil. Ar. (opp. t. ii. p. 400 ss.) It looks like a disposition of this emperor towards the Christians, that Origen wrote letters both to him and his spouse Severus, Eusebius vi. 36.

[9] Of the earlier persecutions, it is said by Origenes contra Celsum iii. p. 116: ὀλίγοι κατὰ καιροὺς καὶ σφόδρα εὐαριθμητοι περὶ τῆς Χριστιανῶν θεοσεβείας τεθνήκασι.

[10] Gregor. Nyssenus in vita Gregor. Thaumaturgi (opp. t. iii. p. 567): Πέμπει πρὸς τοὺς τῶν ἐθνῶν καθηγουμένους πρόσταγμα, φοβερὰν κατ' αὐτῶν τὴν ἀπειλὴν τῆς τιμωρίας ὁρίζων, εἰ μὴ παντοίοις αἰκίσμοῖς τοὺς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ προσκυνοῦντας διαλωβήσαιντο, καὶ προσαγάγοιεν πάλιν αὐτοὺς φόβῳ τε καὶ τῇ τῶν αἰκισμῶν ἀνάγκῃ τῇ πατρώᾳ τῶν δαιμόνων λατρείᾳ. Descriptions by contemporaries Dionys. Alex. (apud Euseb. vi. 40—42) and Cyprian in his letters and de lapsis lib.—Martyrs: Fabian, bishop of Rome, Babylas of Antioch, Alexander of Jerusalem, Pionius, presbyter at Smyrna (Cyprian. epist. 52: tyrannus infestus sacerdotibus Dei).

[11] Cypriani lib. de lapsis: Ad prima statim verba minantis inimici maximus fratrum numerus fidem suam prodidit, nec prostratus est persecutionis impetu, sed voluntario lapsu se ipse prostravit.—Non exspectaverunt saltem, ut interrogati negarent, ut thus accenderent apprehensi. Ante aciem multi victi, sine congressione prostrati, nec hoc sibi reliquerunt, ut sacrificare idolis viderentur inviti. A later pretext of the libellatici see Cypriani Epist. 52: Ego prius legeram et Episcopo tractante cognoveram, non sacrificandum idolis:—et ideirco ne hoc facerem, quod non licebat, cum occasio libelli fuisset oblata, quem nec ipsum acciperem, nisi ostensa fuisset occasio, ad magistratum vel veni, vel alio eunte mandavi, Christianum me esse, sacrificare mihi non licere, ad aras diaboli me venire non posse; dare me ob hoc praemium, ne quod non licet faciam. Different kinds of them Cypr. Ep. 31: sententiam nostram —protulimus adversus eos, qui se ipsos infideles illicita nefariorum libellorum professione prodiderant,—quo non minus, quam si ad nefarias aras accessissent, hoc ipso quod ipsum contestati fuerant tenerentur; sed etiam adversus illos qui acta fecissent, licet praesentes, cum fierent, non affuissent, cum praesentiam suam utique, ut sic scriberentur mandando,

interruption, continued this persecution.[12] *Valerian* (253—260), gave the Christians rest for some time, but was induced by his favourite *Macrianus* (257), to renew the persecution.[13] *Gallienus* (260—268), first put a stop to it;[14] and in the stormy times that now succeeded, the emperors had too much to do with antagonist emperors, rebellions, and barbarians, to think of persecuting the Christians. Only *Aurelian* (270—275), issued an edict against them, the execution of which was prevented by his murder that immediately followed. When the empire had received from *Diocletian* (284—305), four rulers, (285, *Maximian*, Augustus of the west—292, the Cæsars, *Galerius* and *Constantius Chlorus*), the church was at first undisturbed, notwithstanding the enmity of *Galerius*. The Christians attained to the most important offices, and the church was raised to a condition externally prosperous (*Euseb.* viii. 1). The alleged

fecissent. Id. lib. de lapsis: Nec sibi quominus agant poenitentiam blandiantur, qui etsi nefandis sacrificiis manus non contaminaverunt, libellis tamen conscientiam polluerunt. Et illa professio denegantis contestatio et Christiani: [est Christiani], quod fuerat abnuentis. Fecisse se dixit quidquid alius faciendo commisit. Cf. Mosheim de reb. Chr. ante Const. M. p. 483.

[12] Dionys. Alex. ap. Euseb. vii. 1.—Cyprïani epist. 57, 58, et lib. ad Demetrianum.

[13] Dionys. Alex. ap Euseb. vii. 10, 11.—Cypriani epist. 82, according to the report of his messengers sent to Rome: Quae sunt in vero ita se habent. Rescripsisse Valerianum ad Senatum, ut Episcopi et Presbyteri et Diacones in continenti animadvertantur, Senatores vero et egregii viri et equites Romani, dignitate amissa, etiam bonis spolientur, et si ademptis facultatibus Christiani esse perseveraverint, capite quoque multentur; matronae vero ademptis bonis in exsilium relegentur, Caesariani autem, quicunque vel prius confessi fuerant, vel nunc confessi fuerint, confiscentur, et vincti in Caesarianas possessiones descripti mittantur. Martyrs: Cyprian (vita et passio Cypr. scripta per Pontium diaconum ejus and Acta proconsularia ejusd. apud Ruinart), Sixtus II., bishop of Rome, and Laurentius his deacon, (Prudentius *περὶ στεφάνων* Hymn. 2).

[14] The first laws of toleration. Two rescripts addressed on this subject to Christian bishops are quoted by Eusebius vii. 13. The first is that by which Gallienus, after he had conquered Egypt (261), makes known to the bishops in that country the toleration which had been already announced to the rest of the empire: *τὴν εὐεργεσίαν τῆς ἐμῆς δωρεᾶς διὰ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου ἐκβιβασθῆναι προσέταξα. ὅπως ἀπὸ τῶν τόπων τῶν θρησκευσίμων ἀποχωρήσωσι. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὑμεῖς τῆς ἀντιγραφῆς τῆς ἐμῆς τῷ τύπῳ χρῆσθαι δύνασθε, ὥστε μηδένα ὑμῖν ἐνοχλεῖν.* The other he issued *τὰ τῶν καλουμένων κοιμητηρίων ἀπολαμβάνειν ἐπιτρέπων χωρία.*

persecution of *Maximian* in Gaul and Rome is very improbable.[15] But in February 303, *Diocletian*, moved by superstition[16] and the persuasions of *Galerius* and *Hierocles*, caused the splendid church in Nicomedia to be destroyed, and then issued in succession three edicts against the Christians,[17] which were finally

[15] Legio Thebaea, leg. felix Agaunensis, Thebaei with their leader (primicerius) Mauricius (286?) massacred in Acaunensibus angustiis (Agaunum, St Maurice in Wallis). Eusebius, Lactantius, Prudentius, Sulpicius Severus, are silent on the subject. The first mention of it is about 520 in vita S. Romani (Acta SS. Februar. t. iii. p. 740). Then by Avitus, archbishop of Vienne, († 523), dicta in Basilica SS. Agaunensium in innovatione monasterii ipsius vel passione martyrum. By Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, (about 530), Passio SS. Mauricii ac sociorum ejus (apud Ruinart).—These Latin acta appear to have been transferred with arbitrary alterations, by Simeon Metaphrasta (Acta SS. Februar. t. iii. p. 237) to a Greek martyr, Mauricius (Theodoret Graec. affect. curat. disput. viii. in fine) who, as tribunus milit. is said to have been executed along with seventy soldiers in Apamea, in Syria, by the command of Maximianus. Against this narrative: Jean Dubordieu diss. hist. et crit. sur le martyre de la Légion Thébéenne. Amst. 1705, 12. Dafür Jos. de L'Isle défense de la vérité de la Légion Thébéenne. Nancy 1737, 12. Later additions respecting Thebans, who are said to have suffered in other places, ex. gr. Gregor. Turon. de gloria martyr. i. 62. Est apud Agrippinensem urbem basilica, in qua dicuntur L. viri ex illa legione sacra Thebaeorum pro Christi nomine martyrium consummasse. Ado (about 860) has, on the other hand, even: Gereon et alii cccxviii. Pavia has had the whole scene transferred to its neighbourhood in later times (Act. SS. September t. vi. p. 377, 908 ss.) Perhaps the misunderstood expression, milites christi, gave rise to most of these legends.

[16] Constantine, ap. Euseb. de vita Constant. ii. 50, 51, speaks of this from report.

[17] Concerning all these persecutions comp. the contemporaries, Lactantius de mortibus persecutorum, c. 7 ss. and Eusebius hist. eccl. libb. viii.—x. First edict, Euseb. viii. 2, τὰς μὲν ἐκκλησίας εἰς ἔδαφος φέρειν, τὰς δὲ γραφὰς ἀφανεῖς πυρὶ γενέσθαι· καὶ τοὺς μὲν τιμῆς ἐπειλημμένους, ἀτίμους· τοὺς δ' ἐν οἰκετίαις, εἰ ἐπιμένοιεν ἐν τῇ τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ προλήψει, ἐλευθερίας στερεῖσθαι. (Rufin. ne, se quis servorum permansisset Christianus, libertatem consequi posset.) Lactant. de mort. persec. c. 13. Postridie propositum est edictum, quo cavebatur, ut religionis illius homines carerent omni honore ac dignitate, tormentis subjecti essent, ex quocunque ordine ac gradu venirent, adversus eos omnis actio caleret; ipsi non de injuria, non de adulterio, non de rebus ablatis agere possent; libertatem denique ac vocem non haberent. For explanation of this edict see Mosheim de rebus Christ. ante Const. M. p. 925 s.—Second edict Euseb. viii. 6, 8, (cf. viii. 2, 3): τοὺς πανταχόθεν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν προεστῶτας εἱρκταῖς καὶ δεσμοῖς ἐνεῖραι. Third edict Euseb. viii. 6, 10: τοὺς

succeeded by a *fourth* in 304, by virtue of which all Christians without exception were compelled to worship the gods.[18] Thus there arose in the entire Roman empire, with the exception of Gaul, where *Constantius Chlorus* was even now well-disposed towards the Christians,[19] the most violent persecution against them, abundant both in martyrs and in apostates, (a new class called *traditores).* After the two Augusti had laid down their dignity; (305), the persecution continued to rage in *the east* under the new Augustus, *Galerius* and his Caesar, *Maximin.*[20] In *Gaul* and *Spain,* however, it ceased entirely under the Augustus *Constantius Chlorus;* and in *Italy* and *Africa* under the Caesar *Severus,* it at least abated. After the death of *Constantius Chlorus,* (306), his son *Constantine* not only granted full liberty of worship to the Christians in Gaul and Spain; but the two Augusti also, *Maxentius* and *Maximian,* caused persecution to cease in Italy and Africa.[21] In the east, the persecution had

καταπλείστους, θύσαντας μὲν, ἐᾷν βαδίζειν ἐπ' ἐλευθερίας, ἐνισταμένους δὲ μυρίαις καταξαίνειν βασάνοις. (Cf. Euseb. viii: 2, 3: πάσῃ μηχανῇ θύειν ἐξαναγκάζειν).

[18] Fourth edict Eusebius de martyribus Palaestinae c. 3: καθολικῷ προστάγματι πάντας πανδημεὶ τοὺς κατὰ πόλιν θύειν τε καὶ σπένδειν τοῖς εἰδώλοις ἐκελεύετο, κ. τ. λ.

[19] Lactant. de mort. persec. c. 15: Constantius, ne dissentire a majorum (i.e. Augustorum) praeceptis videretur, conventicula, id est parietes, qui restitui poterant, dirui passus est, verum autem Dei templum, quod est in hominibus, incolume servavit. c. 16: Vexabatur ergo universa terra, et praeter Gallias ab oriente usque ad occasum tres acerbissimae bestiae saeviebant. Hence the Donatist bishops, A.D. 313, wrote to Constantine (Optat. Milevit. i. c. 22): pater inter caeteros imperatores persecutionem non exercuit, et ab hoc facinore immunis est Gallia.

[20] Martyrs in Palestine. Eusebius de mart. Palaest. liber (Pamphilus presbyter in Caesarea); in other countries, Euseb. h. e. viii. 7—13. (Peter, bishop of Alexandria; Lucian, presbyter in Antioch), Ruinart acta primorum martyrum. Respecting the martyrs in Egypt comp. the Coptic acts, which, at least in later times, have been greatly overstated, in De miraculis s. Coluthi et reliquiis actorum s. Panesniv martyrum thebaica fragmenta duo. opera A. A. Georgii. Romae 1793, 4. In the praef. p. cxl. ss. there is a chronological survey of the persecution, and of the Egyptian martyrs.

[21] Lactant. de mort. persecut. c. 24: Suscepto imperio Constantinus Augustus nihil egit prius, quam Christianos cultui ac Deo suo reddere. Haec fuit prima ejus sanctio sanctae religionis restitutae (i.e. restitutionis). Euseb. viii. 14: Μαξέντιος—ἀρχόμενος μὲν τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς πίστιν ἐπ' ἀρεσκείᾳ καὶ κολακείᾳ τοῦ δήμου Ῥωμαίων καθυπεκρίνατο· ταύτῃ τε τοῖς ὑπηκόοις τὸν Χριστιανῶν ἀνεῖναι προστάττει διωγμόν.

been terminated by the edict which *Galerius* issued shortly before his death (311);[22] but in the Asiatic east, six months after, *Maximin* caused it to be renewed.[23] When *Constantine*, after conquering Maxentius (312), had become sole lord of the west, he issued, in conjunction with *Licinius*, ruler of the European east, an *edict of universal toleration for all religions*. This was soon followed by a particular *edict in favour of the Christians*, issued from Milan (313).[24] This edict became valid through the

[22] Lactant. de mort. persecut. c. 34. Euseb. viii. 17: Imp. Caesar Galerius Valerius Maximianus caet., et Imp. Caesar Flavius Valerius Constantinus, caet., et Imp. Caesar Valerius Licinius caet. Provincialibus S.—Inter caetera, quae pro reipublicae semper commodis atque utilitate disponimus, nos quidem voluerамus antehac juxta leges veteres et publicam disciplinam Romanorum cuncta corrigere, atque id providere, ut etiam Christiani, qui parentum suorum reliquerant sectam, ad bonas mentes redirent. Siquidem quanam ratione tanta eosdem Christianos voluntas invasisset, et tanta stultitia occupasset, ut non illa veterum instituta sequerentur, quae forsitan primum parentes eorundem constituerant (cf. § 55): sed pro arbitrio suo, atque ut hisdem erat libitum, ita sibimet leges facerent, quas observarent, et per diversa varios populos congregarent? Denique cum ejusmodi nostra jussio extitisset, ut ad veterum se instituta conferrent, multi periculo subjugati, multi, etiam deturbati sunt. Atquo cum plurimi in proposito perseverarent, ac videremus, nec Diis eosdem cultum ac religionem debitam exhibere, nec Christianorum Deum observare; contemplatione mitissimae nostrae clementiae intuentes et consuetudinem sempiternam, qua solemus cunctis hominibus veniam indulgere, promtissimam in his quoque indulgentiam nostram credidimus porrigendam, ut denuo sint Christiani, et conventicula sua componant, ita ut ne quid contra disciplinam agant. Alia autem epistola judicibus significaturi sumus, quid debeant observare. Unde juxta hanc indulgentiam nostram debebunt Deum suum orare pro salute nostra, et reipublicae, ac sua, ut undiqueversum respublica perstet incolumis, et securi vivere in sedibus suis possint.

[23] See the description in Euseb. xi. 1—8.

[24] Ap. Lactant. de mort. persec. c. 48. The beginning has been preserved only in the Greek version apud Euseb. x. 5: Ἤδη μὲν πάλαι σκοποῦντες τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς θρησκείας οὐκ ἀρνητέαν εἶναι, ἀλλ' ἑνὸς ἑκάστου τῇ διανοίᾳ καὶ βουλήσει ἐξουσίαν δοτέον τοῦ τὰ θεῖα πράγματα τιμελεῖν κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ προαίρεσιν, ἕκαστον κεκελεύκειμεν, τούς τε Χριστιανούς, τῆς αἱρέσεως καὶ τῆς θρησκείας τῆς ἑαυτῶν τὴν πίστιν φυλάττειν. Ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ πολλαὶ καὶ διάφοροι αἱρέσεις (i.e. conditiones as below) ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἀντιγραφῇ, ἐν ᾗ τοῖς αὐτοῖς συνεχωρήθη ἡ τοιαύτη ἐξουσία, ἐδόκουν προστεθεῖσθαι σαφῶς, τυχὸν ἴσως τινὲς αὐτῶν μετ' ὀλίγον ἀπὸ τῆς τοιαύτης παραφυλάξεως ἀνεκρούοντο. (Quamobrem) cum feliciter tam ego Constantinus Aug., quam etiam ego Licinius Aug. apud Mediolanum convenissemus, atque universa, quae ad commoda et securitatem publicam pertinerent, in tractatu haberemus; haec inter cetera, quae videbamus pluribus hominibus

whole Roman empire after the overthrow of Maximin, which soon followed.

profutura, vel imprimis ordinanda esse credidimus, quibus divinitatis reverentia continebatur: ut daremus et Christianis et omnibus liberam potestatem sequendi religionem, quam quisque voluisset, quo quicquid est divinitatis in sede coelesti, nobis atque omnibus, qui sub potestate nostra sunt constituti, placatum ac propitium possit existere. Itaque hoc consilio salubri ac rectissima ratione ineundum esse credidimus, ut nulli omnino facultatem abnegandam putaremus, qui vel observationi Christianorum, vel ei religioni mentem suam dederet, quam ipsi sibi aptissimam esse sentiret, ut possit nobis summa divinitas, cujus religioni liberis mentibus obsequimur, in omnibus solitum favorem suum benevolentiamque praestare. Quare scire dignationem tuam convenit, placuisse nobis, ut amotis omnibus omnino conditionibus (Euseb. τῶν αἱρέσεων), quae prius scriptis ad officium tuum datis super Christianorum nomine videbantur, nunc caveres, ut simpliciter unusquisque eorum, qui eandem observandae religionis Christianorum gerunt voluntatem, citra ullam inquietudinem ac molestiam sui id ipsum observare contendant. Quae sollicitudini tuae plenissime significanda esse credidimus, quo scires, nos liberam atque absolutam colendae religionis suae facultatem hisdem Christianis dedisse. Quod cum hisdem a nobis indultum esse perviderit, intelligit dignatio tua, etiam aliis religionis suae vel observantiae potestatem similiter apertam et liberam pro quiete temporis nostri esse concessam, ut in colendo, quod quisque delegerit, habeat liberam facultatem, quia [nolumus detrahi] honori neque cuiquam religioni aliquid a nobis. Atque hoc insuper in persona Christianorum statuendum esse censuimus; quod si eadem loca, ad quae antea convenire consueverant, de quibus etiam datis ad officium tuum literis certa antehac forma fuerat comprehensa, priore tempore aliqui vel a fisco nostro vel ab alio quocunque videntur esse mercati, eadem Christianis sine pecunia et sine ulla pretii petitione, postposita omni frustratione atque ambiguitate, restituantur. Qui etiam dono fuerunt consecuti, eadem similiter hisdem Christianis quantocius reddant. Et vel hi, qui emerunt, vel qui dono fuerunt consecuti, si putaverint, de nostra benevolentia aliquid vicarium postulent, quo et ipsis per nostram clementiam consulatur. Quae omnia corpori Christianorum protinus per intercessionem tuam ac sine mora tradi oportebit. Et quoniam iidem Christiani non ea loca tantum, ad quae convenire consueverunt, sed alia etiam habuisse noscuntur, ad jus corporis eorum, id est ecclesiarum, non hominum singulorum, pertinentia: ea omnia lege, qua superius, comprehendimus, citra ullam prorsus ambiguitatem vel controversiam hisdem Christianis, id est corpori et conventiculis eorum, reddi jubebis; supra dicta scilicet ratione servata, ut ii, qui eadem sine pretio, sicut diximus, restituerint, indemnitatem de nostra benevolentia sperent. In quibus omnibus supra dicto corpori Christianorum intercessionem tuam efficacissimam exhibere debebis, ut praeceptum nostrum quantocius compleatur; quo etiam in hoc per clementiam nostram quieti publicae consulatur. Hactenus fiet, ut sicut superius comprehensum est, divinus juxta nos favor, quem in tan-

With regard to the history of *Constantine's* religious development,[25] till the time when he fully embraced Christianity, we have only isolated intimations and hints. His first religious sentiments, like those of his father, were essentially the new platonic. He acknowledged one supreme God who had revealed himself in many ways among men,[26] and honoured Apollo in particular, as the revealer of this Being.[27] As this idea of Apollo

tis sumus rebus experti, per omne tempus prospere successibus nostris cum beatitudine publica perseveret. Ut autem hujus sanctionis benevolentiae nostrae forma ad omnium possit pervenire notitiam, prolata programmate tuo haec scripta et ubique proponere, et ad omnium scientiam te perferre conveniet, ut hujus benevolentiae nostrae sanctio latere non possit.

[25] Concerning him Franc. Balduini Constantinus M. s. de Const. Imp. legibus eccl. et civ. libri ii. Basil. 1556. Hal. 1727, 8. C. D. A. Martini Ueber die Einführung der christl. Rel. als Staatsrelig. durch den Kaiser Const. München 1813, 4. J. C. F. Manso Leben Constantins d. G. Breslau 1817, 8. (Hug's Denkschrift zur Ehrenrettung Constantins, in the Zeitschrift f. d. Geistlichk. d. Erzbisth. Freiburg 1829, Heft 3, S. 1 ff. Heinichen Excurs. i. appended to his edition of Euseb. de vita Constant. p. 507 ss.

[26] According to Euseb. de vita Const. i. c. 27, when he first began the expedition against Maxentius: Εὖ δ' ἐννοήσας, ὡς κρείττονος ἢ κατὰ στρατιωτικὴν δέοι αὐτῷ βοηθείας, διὰ τὰς κακοτέχνους καὶ γοητικὰς μαγγανείας τὰς παρὰ τῷ τυράννῳ σπουδαζομένας, θεὸν ἀνεζήτει βοηθόν.—Ἐννοεῖ δῆτα ὁποῖον δέοι θεὸν ἐπιγράψασθαι βοηθόν. ζητοῦντι δ' αὐτῷ ἔννοιά τις ὑπεισῆλθεν· ὡς πλειόνων πρότερον τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐφαψαμένων, οἱ μὲν πλείοσι θεοῖς τὰς σφῶν αὐτῶν ἀναρτήσαντες ἐλπίδας—τέλος οὐκ αἴσιον, εὕραντο·—μόνον δε τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πατέρα,—τὸν ἐπέκεινα τῶν ὅλων θεὸν διὰ πάσης τιμήσαντα ζωῆς, σωτῆρα καὶ φύλακα τῆς βασιλείας, ἀγαθοῦ τε παντὸς χορηγὸν εὑρέσθαι. Ταῦτα παρ' ἑαυτῷ διακρίνας—τὸ μὲν περὶ τοὺς μηδὲν ὄντας θεοὺς ματαιάζειν—μωρίας ἔργον ὑπελάμβανε· τὸν δε πατρῷον τιμᾷν μόνον ᾤετο δεῖν θεόν. The Panegyricus incerti c. 26 (ed. Jaeger i. 548) addressed to the emperor in 313, corresponds with tolerable accuracy to his religious views at the time: Te, summe rerum sator, cujus tot nomina sunt, quot gentium linguas esse voluisti, quem enim te ipse dici velis, scire non possumus: sive in te quaedam vis mensque divina est, qua toto infusus mundo omnibus miscearis elementis, et sine ullo extrinsecus accedente vigoris impulsu per te ipse movearis: sive aliqua supra omne caelum potestas es, quae hoc opus tuum ex altiore naturae arce despicias; te, inquam, oramus caet.

[27] Umenius in the Panegyric received by Constantine 310 at Treves, c. 21: Vidisti enim, credo, Constantine, Apollinem tuum, comitante Victoria, coronas tibi laureas offerentem:—vidisti, teque in illius specie recognovisti, cui totius mundi regna deberi vatum carmina divina cecinerunt. Quod ego nunc demum arbitror contigisse, quum tu sis, ut ille, juvenis, et laetus, et salutifer, et pulcherrimus imperator. Merito igitur augustissima illa delubra tantis donariis honestasti, ut jam vetera non

and the Christian idea of Christ were obviously similar,[28] so Constantine may have thought that he found in it very soon a point of union between Christianity and heathenism. That the phenomenon which appeared to him in the war against Maxentius, respecting which the accounts of his contemporaries are so different,[29] did not yet bring him over exclusively to Chris-

quaerunt. Jam omnia te vocare ad se templa videantur, praecipueque Apollo noster caet. On several coins of Constantine is found the inscription, Soli invicto, Soli invicto comiti. See Ez. Spanheim's remarks on the Césars de l'empereur Julien p. 285 and Remarques p. 973.

[28] On the idea of Apollo, see Baur's Apollonius v. Tyana u. Christus, S. 168. So Julian accuses the Alexandrians (Epist. 51 ed. Spanheim p. 434) of believing Ἰησοῦν χρῆναι θεὸν λόγον ὑπάρχειν, and exhorts them, on the contrary, to worship τὸν μέγαν Ἥλιον, τὸ ζῶν ἄγαλμα καὶ ἔμψυχον, καὶ ἔννουν, καὶ ἀγαθοεργὸν τοῦ νοητοῦ πατρός. That Christ was frequently compared with Apollo, may be seen from Poetae latini minores ed. J. Chr. Wernsdorf iv. 767.

[29] Lactant. de mort. persec. c. 44: commonitus est in quiete Constantinus, ut coeleste signum Dei notaret in scutis, atque ita proelium committeret. Fecit, ut jussus est, et traversa x. littera, summo capite circumflexo, Christum in scutis notat. On the contrary, the heathen Nazarius in Panegyr. ad Constantinum c. 14: In ore denique est omnium Galliarum, exercitus visos, qui se divinitus missos prae se ferebant.—Haec ipsorum sermocinatio, hoc inter audientes ferebant, Constantinum petimus, Constantino imus auxilio. Constantine, immediately after his entry into Rome, caused a cross to be put into the hand of the statue erected to him, with the inscription, τούτῳ τῷ σωτηριώδει σημείῳ, τῷ ἀληθινῷ ἐλέγχῳ τῆς ἀνδρίας, τὴν πόλιν ὑμῶν ἀπὸ ζυγοῦ τοῦ τυράννου δ.α.σωθεῖσαν ἠλευθέρωσα (Euseb. h. e. ix. 9). It was not till he was an old man that he related to Eusebius the story of a cross, which appeared to him at clear mid-day, with the inscription, hac vince, τούτῳ νίκα. Euseb. de vit. Const. i. 28—32. Sozomen, however, i. 3, and Rufin. ix. 9, suppose it to have been a mere dream. The heathen, of course, derided all these stories. See Gelasius Cyzic. hist. conc. Nicaeni i. 4. cf. Mosheim de rebus Christ. ante Const. M. p. 978 ss. Concerning the cipher of Christ's name, see Münter's Sinnbilder der alten Christen, heft i. S. 33 ff. The imperial standard, bearing this cipher, was afterwards called Labarum. See Du Cange diss. de nummis infer. aevi § 20. It is certain that Constantine, even before the battle, supposed that he was directed to the cross as to a propitious sign, and that this could not have happened in a way to attract general notice. If the later narrative of the emperor be not an invention, a light cross of clouds may have appeared to him while in a musing and hesitating mood, and have led him to decide; a phenomenon which was of importance, for this very reason, only to himself, and which remained unobserved by all others. Thus a purple cross, Christmas 1517, was looked upon as a divine sign at Weimar, under the important circumstances of the time (Oratio de Joanne Duce

tianity, is proved by the edict of Milan, which breathes entirely the former syncretistic spirit. But he acted only in the spirit of Christianity when he bestowed favours on the Church, such as the old religion had always enjoyed. Thus he released their clergy from the burdensome municipal offices (312);[30] made valid the manumission of slaves in the churches (prior to 316);[31] allowed legacies to be left to the catholic churches,[32] and contributed a considerable sum himself to the support of the African

Sax. in Melanthonis Opp. ed. Bretschneider xi. 958). In like manner a white cross, which appeared at the entrance of John Frederick, the elector, into Weimar, when he returned from captivity (Hortleder vom teutschen Kriege, Th. 2, S. 966). Several like traditions owed their origin at this time to the feeling that the decisive struggle between heathenism and Christianity, between Christ and demons, was come. Thus it is related that a victory-bringing prayer was taught by an angel to Licinius before the battle with Maximin (Lactant. de mort. persecut. c. 46). Thus, according to Gregory of Nazianzum, an army of demons accompanied Julian on his Persian expedition; but, according to Libanius, it was an army of gods. See Ullmann's Gregor. v. Nazianz. S. 100.

[30] The first law ad Anulinum Procons. Africae apud Euseb. h. e. x. c. 7, confirmed by a second Cod. Theod. xvi. tit. ii. l. 1, A.D. 313, and repeated in the third l. c. l. 2 A.D. 319. The last: Qui divino cultui ministeria impendunt, i.e. hi qui Clerici appellantur, ab omnibus omnino muneribus excusentur, ne sacrilego livore quorundam a divinis obsequiis avocentur. Here Constantine merely transferred to the Christian clergy a privilege enjoyed by heathen priests. cf. Symmachus lib. x. Ep. 54: Insigne ducitur Sacerdotii vacare muneribus. Cod. Theod. xii. tit. 1, l. 75, and Gothofred. ad h. l. The presidents of the Jews also enjoyed this immunity. cf. Cod. Theod. xvi. tit. viii. l. 3, A.D. 321. Decurionibus Agrippinensibus: Cunctis Ordinibus generali lege concedimus, Judaeos vocare ad Curiam. Verum, ut aliquid ipsis ad solatium pristinae observationis relinquatur, binos vel ternos privilegio perpeti (i.e. perpetuo) patimur nullis nominationibus occupari. Lex. 2, A.D. 330: Qui devotione tota Synagogis Judaeorum Patriarchiis vel Presbyteriis se dederunt, et in memorata secta degentes legi ipsi praesident, immunes ab omnibus tam personalibus quam civilibus muneribus perseverent. Lex. 4, A.D. 331: Hiereos, et Archisynagogos, et Patres Synagogarum, et caeteros, qui Synagogis deserviunt, ab omni corporali munere liberos esse praecipimus.

[31] According to Sozomen i. 9, he issued three laws on this subject. The first is lost. The second may be seen in Cod. Justin. i. tit. 13, l. 1, A.D. 316. The third, ibid. l. 2, and Cod. Theod. iv. tit. 7, l. unic. A.D. 321. That this manumission was transferred from the heathen temple to the churches, is shown by Gothofredus on the last law.

[32] Cod. Theod. xvi. tit. 2 l. 4. and Cod. Just. i. tit. 2, l. 1: Habeat

clergy.[33] Other regulations in favour of the Christians owed their immediate origin to that syncretistic tendency of the emperor. Thus he set bounds to the enmity of the Jews against the Christians, their rigid inflexibility not generally agreeing with his measures.[34] He abolished several regulations offensive to the Christians (315);[35] and decreed the general observance of Sunday (321).[36] It cannot appear strange that, although he

unusquisque licentiam, sanctissimo catholico venerabilique concilio decedens bonorum quod optaverit relinquere.

[33] Namely 3000 folles (upwards of 70,000 thalers). cf. Const. epist. ad Caecilianum Episc. Carthag. in Euseb. h. e. x. c. 6.

[34] Cod. Theod. xvi. tit. 8, l. 1, A.D. 315: Judaeis, et Majoribus eorum, et Patriarchis volumus intimari, quod si qui, post hanc legem, aliquem, qui eorum feralem fugerit sectam, et ad Dei cultum respexerit, saxis aut alio furoris genere (quod nunc fieri cognoscimus) ausus fuerit adtemptare, mox flammis dedendus et cum omnibus suis particibus concremandus. Si quis vero ex populo ad eorum nefariam sectam accesserit, et conciliabulis eorum se adplicaverit, cam ipsis poenas meritas sustinebit.

[35] Cod. Theod. ix. tit. 40, l. 2, A.D. 315: Si quis in ludum fuerit, vel in metallum damnatus, minime in ejus facie scribatur:—quo facies, quae ad similitudinem pulchritudinis coelestis est figurata, minime maculetur. Probably in the same year vetus veterrimumque supplicium patibulorum et cruribus suffringendis primus removit (Aur. Victor de Caes. c. 41; Sozom. i. 8). Cod. Theod. viii. tit. 15, l. 1, A.D. 320: Qui jure veteri caelibes habebantur: imminentibus legum (namely L. Julia and Papia Poppaea) terroribus liberentur, &c. (cf. Euseb. de vit. Const. iv. 26.)

[36] The first law of March 321 is in Cod. Justin. iii. tit. 12, l. 3: Omnes judices, urbanaeque plebes, et cunctarum artium officia venerabili die Solis quiescant. Ruri tamen positi agrorum culturae libere licenterque inserviant: quoniam frequenter evenit, ut non aptius alio die frumenta sulcis, aut vineae scrobibus mandentur (as agricultural labours of this kind had been permitted on festivals according to a Roman custom, Virgil. Georg. i. v. 268 ss. Cato de re rust. c. 2. cf. Erycius Puteanus de Nundinis Romanis c. 10 in Graevii thes. antiquitt. Rom. t. viii. p. 658). The second of June, in the same year, in the Cod. Theod. ii. tit. 8, l. 1, with the addition: emancipandi et manumittendi die festo cuncti licentiam habeant, et super his rebus actus non prohibeantur. The Egyptian week, the seven days of which were dedicated to the planets, had been made known to the Romans by the astrologers even since the first century. In the second, the days were frequently named after the planets (Dio Cassius xxxvii. c. 18. S. Mursinna de hebdomade gentilium et diorum a planetis denominatione in Jo. Oelrichs Germaniae literatae opuscula historico-philologica-theologica. Bremae 1772, i. 113). As Christ was often compared with Sol, or Apollo (see above not. 28), so Constantine believed, perhaps, that in the festival of the dies solis, as a festival of Christ and the sun at the same time, he found a point of friendly union between both religions, directly opposed though they were to

allowed exactly the same freedom to heathenism, and not only so, but even in his capacity of emperor, observed the heathen practices at the same time that he gave so many privileges to Christianity,[37] he should notwithstanding turn away the minds of the heathen people by those very measures, in proportion as he gained over the affections of the Christians towards himself. In the mean time the successful issue of his undertakings must have strengthened him in the direction he took, if we may judge by his peculiar mode of thinking; and it could not escape his political sagacity, that it would be most advantageous for him to have on his side even the smaller party, since it was the more closely united, and more animated by a living soul. In this manner the Christians formed the nucleus of Constantine's party when the relation between him and Licinius became looser. Hence, for this very reason, Licinius sought to obtain a more decided party by renewed attention to the religion of the pagans, and by persecution of the Christians.[38] Accordingly, the struggle that arose between Licinius and Constantine A.D. 323, was at the same time a struggle between Christianity and heathenism. Licinius was defeated, and Constantine openly professed the Christian faith,[39] though he still put off baptism.[40]

each other. He transferred the Nundines to Sunday: comp. the stone inscription apud Erycius Puteanus de Nundinis Romanis c. 26: Constantinus—provisione etiam pietatis suae Nundinas die solis perpeti anno constituit. Still, the Nundines and weeks were both in use, and both are found in a calendar composed about 354 (in Graevii thes. t. viii. p. 97) beside each other, until Theodosius the First made the law respecting the observance of Sunday strict, Cod. Theod. viii. tit. 8, l. 3. Eusebius de vit. Constant. iv. 18 and Sozomen i. 8, relate that Friday was also observed, as well as Sunday, by order of Constantine.

[37] Cod. Theod. ix. 16, 1, 2 (A.D. 319) xvi. 10, 1 (A.D. 321) Zosimus ii. 29. ἐχρῆτο δὲ ἔτι καὶ τοῖς πατρίοις ἱεροῖς.

[38] Euseb. h. e. x. 8, de vita Constant. ii. 3 ss.

[39] Euseb. de vita Const. iii. 2. τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ σὺν παῤῥησίᾳ τῇ πάσῃ προσβεύων εἰς πάντας διετέλει, μὴ ἐγκαλυπτόμενος τὴν σωτήριον ἐπηγορίαν. After the year 323, the heathen symbols disappear from Constantine's coins. J. Eckhel doctrina numorum veterum p. ii. vol. viii. (Vindob. 1798. 4.), p. 79.

[40] Modern Catholic Church historians no longer maintain what was asserted as late as Baronius, Schelstraten, and others, that Constantine was baptised in Rome by Sylvester A.D. 324. Comp. Euseb. de vita Constant. iv. 61, 62. That Constantine made donations to Sylvester on this occasion is related first in the Acta Sylvestri, then by Hadrian i., A.D. 780 (see below, in volume second. Div. 1, § 5). In the ninth century an original document respecting a great gift of land came to

§ 57.

SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

In this division of time also, the progress of Christianity was considerable,[1] especially in *Gaul*.[2] In the end of it we find the

light. The supposititious character of both authorities was perceived so early as 999 by Otto III., and in 1152 by the Romans (vol. ii.) The spirited attack of Laurentius Valla (about 1440, vol. ii., Div. 5, § 154) did not produce much effect till after the Reformation. Since then the investiture has been defended merely by some of the older Catholic scholars, especially the Jesuits J. Gretser and Nic. Schaten; but the deed of investiture has been universally given up as spurious.

The number of persecutions has been fixed at ten since the fourth century, agreeably to Exod. vii. 10 and Apoc. xvii. 1—14. Different calculations: Sulpicius Severus hist. sacr. ii. 33. Sacris vocibus decem plagis mundum afficiendum pronunciatum est: ita quum jam novem fuerint, quae superest, ultima erit. On the other side, Augustin. de civ. Dei xviii. 52. Nonnullis visum est, vel videtur, non amplius ecclesiam passuram persecutiones usque ad tempus Antichristi, quam quot jam passa est, id est decem, ut undecima novissima sit ab Antichristo. The enumeration in Augustine l. c. is the following (the deviations in Sulpicius Severus ii. 29—32 are enclosed in parenthesis): I. Neronis, II. Domitiani, III. Trajani, (IV. Hadriani): IV. (V.) Marci Aurelii, V. (VI.) Sept. Severi, VI. Maximini, VII. (VII.) Decii, VIII. (VIII.) Valeriani, IX. Aureliani, X. (IX.) Diocletiani. Augustinus l. c. adds: Sed ego illa re gesta in Aegypto istas persecutiones prophetice significatas esse non arbitror, quamvis ab eis, qui hoc putant, exquisite et ingeniose illa singula his singulis comparata videantur: non prophetico spiritu, sed conjectura mentis humanae, qui aliquando ad verum pervenit, aliquando fallitur.

[1] Origines c. Cels. iii. p. 116, points to this, Χριστιανοὺς μὴ ἀμελεῖν τοῦ παντα χοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐπισπείρειν τὸν λόγον. Τινες γοῦν ἔργον πεποίηνται ἐκπεριέρχεσθαι οὐ μόνον πόλεις, ἀλλὰ καὶ κώμας, καὶ ἐπαύλεις. Respecting the extension of Christianity about 300, see Arnobius i. c. 16. Si Alamannos, Persas, Scythas (Dii) iccirco voluerunt devinci, quod habitarent et degerent in eorum gentibus Christiani; quemadmodum Romanis tribuere victoriam, cum habitarent et degerent in eorum quoque gentibus Christiani? Si in Asia, Syria iccirco mures et locustas effervescere prodigialiter voluerunt, quod ratione consimili habitarent in eorum gentibus Christiani: in Hispania, Gallia cur eodem tempore horum nihil natum est, cum innumeri viverent in his quoque provinciis Christiani? Si apud Getulos, Tinguitanos hujus rei causa siccitatem satis ariditatemque miserunt, eo anno cur messes amplissimas Mauris Nomadibusque tribuerunt cum religio similis his quoque in regionibus verteretur?

[2] Passio Saturnini Episc. Tolosani c. 2, apud Ruinart: postquam sen-

first traces of bishops *on the Rhine*.[3] About the same time they also appear in *Britain*.[4] The first traces of Christianity are now seen in *Vindelicia*.[5] Even among the Goths it had become known by means of captives.[6]

sim et gradatim in omnem terram Evangeliorum sonus exivit, parique progressu in regionibus nostris Apostolorum praedicatio coruscavit: cum rarae in aliquibus civitatibus ecclesiae paucorum Christianorum devotione consurgerent;—ante annos L. sicut actis publicis (Codd. alii: ante annos satis plurimos), i. e. Decio et Grato Consulibus (i. e. 250, A.D.) sicut fideli recordatione retinetur, primum et summum Christi Tolosa civitas s. Saturninum habere coeperat sacerdotem. From this Gregorius Turonensis (about 590) hist. Franc. i. c. 28: Decii. tempore septem viri Episcopi ad praedicandum in Gallias missi sunt, sicut historia passionis s. martyris Saturnini denarrat. Ait enim: Sub Decio et Grato Consulibus &c. as above. Hi ergo missi sunt: Turonicis Gratianus Episcopus, Arelatensibus Trophimus Episc., Narbonae Paulus Episc., Tolosae Saturninus Episc., Parisiacis Dionysius Episc., Arvernis Stremonius Episc., Lemovicinis Martialis est destinatus Episcopus. This is evidently an arbitrary combination of several traditions. Trophimus must have been first bishop of Arles even before Decius, for in 254 Marcian had been for a long time bishop of the place. See Cypriani, ep. 67, Pearson annales Cyprianici ad ann. 254, § 7 ss. With this also agrees Zosimi P. epist. i. ad Episcopos Galliae, A.D. 417, (apud Constant): Metropolitanae Arelatensium urbi vetus privilegium minime derogandum est, ad quam primum ex hac sede Trophimus summus Antistes, ex cujus fonte totae Galliae fidei rivulos acceperunt, directus est.

[3] First, in the commission appointed by Constantine to decide upon the Donatist controversy in Rome, in the year 313, Optat. Milev. de schism. Donatist. i. c. 23: Dati sunt judices Maternus ex Agrippina civitate: then among the names subscribed to the acts of the Concil. Arelatense, in the year 314: Maternus Episcopus, Macrinus Diaconus de civitate Agrippinensium.—Agroecius Episcopus, Felix exorcista de civitate Treverorum. Nic. ab Honteim hist. diplom. Trevirana in prodromo T. i. p. 64 ss. Walch de Materno uno in the Commentationes Soc. Gotting. vol. i. (1779) p. 1 ss.

[4] Names subscribed to the Concil. Arelat.: Eborius episcopus, de civitate Eboracensi, provincia Britannia.—Restitutus episcopus, de civitate Londinensi, provincia suprascripta. Adelfius episcopus, de civitate colonia Londinensium (perhaps Colonia Lindi i. e. Lincoln) comp. Jac. Usserii Britannicarum ecclesiar. antiquitt. Lond. 1687. Bingham origg. eccl. tom. iii. p. 557 ss.

[5] Afra burnt in Augsburg A.D. 304. See the Acta in Ruinart.

[6] Sozomen. h. e. ii. 6. Philostorg. h. e. ii. 5.

SECOND CHAPTER.

HERETICS.

§ 58.

ELCESAITISM OF THE CLEMENTINES.

Clementina, primum edita in Cotelerii patribus apostolicis i. 597. D. v. Cölln in Ersch u. Grubers Encynclopädie xviii. 36. (Art. Clementinen). Die Glementinen nebst den verwandten Schriften u. der Ebionitismus von Adolph Schliemann. Hamburg 1844. 8.

As Christianity had come to the west from the east, so the occidental church continued in the second century to be entirely dependent on the oriental. Without a peculiar development of doctrine and literature of its own, it merely received the product of the east; while at the same time it drew within itself the different parties of the east. Rome in particular, the capital of the empire and seat of a great church, presented an alluring field to all parties to call forth their activity. The different Gnostic sects,[1] like the Montanists, laboured with emulation to gain over this important church to themselves; and all found in it more or less sympathy and adherence. Accordingly, Romish Christendom in the second century was internally divided in many ways; a condition which was calculated not only to lead many Christians astray and to induce them to waver, but to lay open a dangerous unprotected side to the attacks of heathenism. There, a philosophically educated Christian of Rome,[2] towards the end of the second century, took up the idea that Christianity in its original state must be preserved among the Jewish Christians as the descendants of the oldest church. Probably while he was searching after it himself in its secrecy, and found it dispersed among several parties, he discovered among the

[1] Valentinus (§ 45) and Marcion (§ 47) came in person to Rome.

[2] For evidence to show that the author of the Clementines was a Roman, see Baur's Christuspartei in der korinth. Gemeinde, in the Tübingen Zeitschr. f. Theol. 1851, iv. 199. Schliemann p. 549.

Elcesaites[3] a speculative doctrinal creed already formed, which seemed to him perfectly adapted both to vanquish heathenism and to remove the multiplicity of Christian sects. He received it therefore as the original Christian doctrine which had obtained its central point in James,[4] and in Peter its most important defender, and appropriated all the more readily the Elcesaite rejection of Paul, who, inasmuch as he was not an immediate disciple of Christ, could not have been a genuine apostle,[5] because the Pauline development of Christianity had run out into so great a state of disunion, and appeared to have attained its height in the Marcionite errors. Hence he composed *the Clementines* (τὰ Κλημέντια) consisting of three prologues and twenty (but now only 19) homilies, that he might be able to proclaim to Christendom at large the apostolic truth which had long been concealed, by apostolic lips also. The historical form in which he clothed the whole work, he took in part from the events of his own life. But he reckoned upon it also for the purpose of procuring apostolic authority to his doctrine, and obtaining an introduction for it into Rome in particular. As he himself had sought to travel into the east, so he makes the apostolic *Clement* (who was highly esteemed in the recollection of the Roman church, and who appears here in the character of a distinguished Roman, whose mind had received a philosophical culture),[6] to journey into the same regions for the purpose of meeting with Peter, and obtaining full satisfaction from him. Under the impulses of a strong desire for the truth which had long been sought in vain,[7] Peter, the only one of the immediate

[3] See above § 32.

[4] In the Clementines, James appears as the archbishop of all Christendom, to whom Peter must constantly give an account of his doings, Schliemann S. 86, 213. In the letters prefixed to the Clementines, Peter ites to him [illegible] τῷ ἁγίας Ἐκ[illegible], Clement: [illegible]κώβῳ, τῷ [illegible] καὶ [illegible] Ἰακώβου, διέποντι [illegible] Ἱεροσολύμ[illegible] ἂν Ἐβιβάσ[illegible] [illegible] ἀρχῇ Θεοῦ προνοίᾳ [illegible] χαλε[illegible].

[5] What Peter, [illegible] against Simon [illegible] er to Paul: εἴ τις [illegible] τοὺς διδασκαλίαν [illegible] ἐὰν εἰ μέν ἐξ[illegible] ὑπὸ [illegible] ἐνιαυτῷ ἐγέ[illegible] ἔλθῃ ὁ διδάσκαλος, Schliemann S. 96.

[6] He is manifestly confounded with Flavius Clemens, the relation of Domitian (§ 33). See Baur in the Tübingen Zeitschr. f. Theol. 1831, iv. 199. Schliemann S. 109.

[7] The narrative in Hom. i., in its essential features, may have been modelled after the experiences of the author.

disciples of Christ who had come to Rome, appears here in opposition to Paul, who was the proper apostle of the Gentiles,[8] as the founder of the Romish church and the first bishop of Rome.[9] He triumphantly refutes all kinds of error which had been committed by different persons, not only the popular faith and philosophy of the heathen,[10] but also the Christian aberrations of the second century. The Gnostics in particular are combated in the person of Simon Magus;[11] and in addition to them the Montanist prophesying,[12] the hypostatic doctrine of the Trinity,[13] and millennarianism.[14] On the other hand, Peter proclaims[15] and supports, by mighty miraculous deeds, the following doctrine:

[8] Peter says, Hom. ii. 17, with reference to the law of syzygies: ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν πρῶτος ἦλθεν (John the Baptist, Matt. xi. 11), εἶτα ὁ ἐν υἱοῖς ἀνθρώπων δεύτερος ἐπῆλθεν. Ταύτῃ τῇ τάξει ἀκολουθοῦντα δυνατὸν ἦ νοεῖν, τίνος ἐστὶν Σίμων ὁ πρὸ ἐμοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη πρῶτος ἐλθών, καὶ τίνος ὢν τυγχάνω, ὁ μετ' ἐκεῖνον ἐληλυθώς, καὶ ἐπελθὼν ὡς σκότῳ φῶς, ὡς ἀγνοίᾳ γνῶσις, ὡς νόσῳ ἴασις. Οὕτως δή, ὡς ἀληθὴς ἡμῶν προφήτης εἴρηκεν, πρῶτον ψευδὲς δεῖ ἐλθεῖν εὐαγγέλιον ὑπὸ πλάνου τινός, καὶ εἶθ' οὕτως μετὰ καθαίρεσιν τοῦ ἁγίου τόπου εὐαγγέλιον ἀληθὲς κρύφα διαπεμφθῆναι εἰς ἐπαγόρθωσιν τῶν εσομένων αἱρέσεων.

[9] In the letter prefixed to the Clementines, of Clement to James, Peter is designated ὁ τῆς δύσεως τὸ σκοτεινότερον τοῦ κόσμου μέρος, ὡς πάντων ἱκανώτερος, φωτίσαι κελευσθείς, καὶ κατορθῶσαι δυνηθείς,—μέχρις ἐνταῦθα τῇ Ῥώμῃ γενομένος, θεοβουλήτῳ διδασκαλίᾳ σώζων ἀνθρώπους. It is related how he transferred his καθέδρα to Clement, shortly before his own martyrdom.

[10] Schliemann S. 101.

[11] Schliemann S. 90. In particular, the doctrine of Marcion, see Baur's christliche Gnosis, S. 313.

[12] Hom. iii. 12 ss.; xvii. 13 ss. Schwegler's Montanismus S. 142. Schliemann S. 547.

[13] Hom. xvi. 12: Εἷς ἐστιν, ὁ τῇ αὐτοῦ σοφίᾳ εἰπών· ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον· ἡ δὲ σοφία, ὥσπερ ἰδίῳ πνεύματι, αὐτὸς ἀεὶ συνέχαιρεν· ἤνωται μὲν ὡς ψυχὴ τῷ θεῷ, ἐκτείνεται δὲ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ὡς χεὶρ δημιουργοῦσα τὸ πᾶν·—κατὰ γὰρ ἔκτασιν καὶ συστολὴν ἡ μονὰς δυὰς εἶναι νομίζεται. (In explanation of the ἐκτείνει cf. Philo de somniis p. 577: ὁ ἀνθρώπινος νοῦς,—καθάπερ ἥλιος, τὰς αὐτοῦ δυνάμεις ὥσπερ ἀκτῖνας εἰς ἄλλον τείνει. De nominum mutat. p. 1018, τὸ δὲ —δυνάμεις ἔτεινεν εἰς γένεσιν ἐπ' εὐεργεσίᾳ τοῦ συσταθέντος. Quod deterius potiori insidiari solet p. 172: τέμνεται οὐσιν ἢ θείου κατ' ἀπάρτησιν, ἀλλὰ μόνον ἐκτείνεται). Hom. xvi. 15: ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἡμῶν οὔτε θεοὺς εἶναι ἐφθέγξατο παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα τὰ πάντα, οὔτε [illegible] εἶναι ἀνηγόρευσεν. Comp. Baur in the Tüb. Zeitschr. f. Theol. 1831, iv. 151.

[14] It is the false feminine prophesying which, τὸ παρόντα ἐπίγειον πλοῦτον ὡς προῖκα δώσειν ἐπαγγέλλεται (Hom. iii. 23): on the contrary, the male prophesying τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος τὰς ἐλπίδας μηνύων (c. 26).

[15] Neander's Entwickelung der gnost. Systeme S. 361 ff. Dr K. A. Credner über Essäer u. Ebioniten, in Winer's Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl.

God, a pure, simple being of light, has allowed the world to be formed in contrasts, and so also the history of the world and of men runs off in contrasts (*συζυγίαι*) corresponding by way of pairs, in which the lower constantly precedes the higher. From the beginning onward God has revealed himself to men, while his Holy Spirit, (*σοφία, υἱὸς Θεοῦ, Θεῖον πνεῦμα, πνεῦμα ἅγιον*) from time to time in the form of individual men, (Adam, Enoch, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Jesus), as the true prophet (*ὁ προφήτης τῆς ἀληθείας*) constantly announced the very same truth, and in Jesus, caused it also to be communicated to the heathen.[16] According to the law of syzygies, false prophets also are always produced in addition to the true (*γεννητοὶ γυναικῶν* Matth. xi. 11),[17] who corrupt the truth. Thus the original doctrines of Mosaism are perfectly identical with Christianity;[18] though they have not been preserved in their purity in the Pentateuch,[19] which was not composed till long after Moses; and in the present form of Judaism, have been utterly perverted. In general, the truth has been constantly maintained in its purity only by a few by means of secret tradition.[20]

Theologie i. 237 ff. and 277 ff. Baur's christl. Gnosis S. 300. Schliemann S. 130.

[16] Hom. iii. 20. *ἐκεῖνος,—ὃς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αἰῶνος ἅμα τοῖς ὀνόμασιν μορφὰς ἀλλάσσων, τὸν αἰῶνα τρέχει, μέχρις ὅτε ἰδίων χρόνων τυχὼν, διὰ τοὺς καμάτους Θεοῦ ελέει χρισθείς, εἰς ἀεὶ ἕξει τὴν ἀνάπαυσιν.* The original unpersonal Holy Spirit united himself in Adam with a human person, which appeared, constantly the same, as the true prophet successively in different forms (Baur's Gnosis, S. 362), and is destined for the government of the everlasting kingdom. If one abides by this view, he will not have to assume with Schliemann, S. 142, that a variation prevails in the Clementines respecting the doctrine of the Spirit of God, because he is represented sometimes as an unpersonal energy, sometimes as a hypostasis.

[17] Hom. iii. 23. *Δύο ἡμῖν γενικαὶ ἔστωσαν προφητεῖαι· ἡ μὲν ἀρρενική· ἡ δὲ δευτέρα, θῆλυς οὖσα, πρώτη ὡρίσθη ἔρχεσθαι ἐν τῇ τῶν συζυγιῶν προελεύσει. Ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν οὖσα, ὡς θήλεια, τοῦ νῦν κόσμου ἐπαγγελλομένη, ἀρσενικὴ εἶναι πιστεύεσθαι θέλει· διὸ κλέπτουσα τὰ τοῦ ἄρσενος σπέρματα, καὶ τοῖς ἰδίοις τῆς σαρκὸς σπέρμασιν ἐπισκέπτουσα, ὡς ὅλα ἴδια συνεκφέρει τὰ γεννήματα, τοῦτ' ἔστιν τὰ ῥήματα, καὶ τὸν παρόντα ἐπίγειον πλοῦτον ὡς προῖκα δώσειν ἐπαγγέλλεται.*

[18] Hom. viii. 6: *μιᾶς δι' ἀμφοτέρων* (Moses and Christ) *διδασκαλίας οὔσης, τὸν τούτων τινὰ πεπιστευκότα ὁ Θεὸς ἀποδέχεται.* c. 7: *πλὴν εἴ τις καταξιωθείη τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐπιγνῶναι, ὡς μιᾶς διδασκαλίας ὑπ' αὐτῶν κεκηρυγμένης, οὗτος ἀνὴρ ἐν Θεῷ πλούσιος κατηρίθμηται, τά τε ἀρχαῖα νέα τῷ χρόνῳ, καὶ τὰ καινὰ παλαιὰ ὄντα νενοηκώς.* cf. Hom. xviii. 14.

[19] Hom. iii. 47.

[20] Hom. iii. 19: Christ designated as *τὰ ἀπ' αἰωνος ἐν κρυπτῷ ἀξίοις*

Man is free, and must expect after death a spiritual continuation of life with rewards and punishments. The conditions of happiness are love to God and man, and struggling against the demons which draw away to evil through sensuality. For this purpose these sectaries prescribed abstinence from animal food, frequent fastings and washings, recommended early marriage[21] and voluntary poverty, but rejected all sacrifice.

While the author of the Clementines, from the position of the Elcesaite doctrine, combats parties with which the Elcesaites had never come into contact, he must necessarily go into many new developments of doctrine. How free his movements were in these may be seen from the fact that he frequently used for his purpose our four gospels unknown to the Elcesaites, with great critical and exegetical arbitrariness.[22] On this very account we might indeed doubt whether he left the Elcesaite doctrine itself entirely untouched.

Although the doctrine here presented could not calculate on any general dissemination, and found several adherents only in *Rome* and *Cyprus*,[23] yet many felt themselves attracted by the historical contents of the production and its refutation of the heathens and the Gnostics; and since the author knew how to account for the late appearance of his work, which pretended to proceed forth from the apostolic age,[24] they rather thought of it

παραδιδόμενα κηρύσσων, μέχρις αὐτων ἐθνῶν τὸν ἔλεον ἐκτείνων, καὶ ψυχὰς πάντων ἐλεῶν.

[21] Hom. iii. 26: (Ὁ ἀληθὴς προφήτης) γάμον νομιστεύει, ἐγκράτειαν συγχωρεῖ, εἰς ὀγνείαν πάντας ἄγει. c. 68: (Οἱ πρεσβύτεροι) νέων μὴ μόνον κατεπειγέτωσαν τοὺς γάμους, ἀλλὰ καὶ των προβεβηκότων, μὴ πως ζέουσα ἡ ὄρεξις προφάσει πορνείας ἢ μοιχείας λοιμὸν προσενέγκοι τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ.

[22] A complete collection of the passages from the gospels in the Clementines may be found in Credner's Beiträge zur Einleit. in d. bibl. Schriften i. 284. According to him the Gospel of Peter lies at the foundation of it. But the passages characteristic of John that appear in the work can hardly be referred to another gospel; and when we take the rule of measurement from them, we cannot expect that the gospel citations generally should be made verbatim.

[23] Epiphanius haer. xxx. 18, says, that Ebionites were in Cyprus, (by this general appellation for all heretical Jewish Christians he here means this party). Origen (ap. Euseb. vi. 38,) calls the heresy of the Elcesaites νεωστὶ ἐπανισταμένην. Since no trace is found of it in the second century beyond Palestine, we may assume that it was first established in those places by the Clementines.

[24] Peter entreats James, in his letter prefixed to the Clementines, to communicate his sermons (τὰς βίβλους μου τῶν κηρυγμάτων) only to faith-

as the corruption of a genuine writing by heretics than of forgery. Hence, another person was soon found, probably an Alexandrian, who conceived the idea of purifying it from heretical depravations, while he altered it entirely according to the standard of orthodoxy in his day. In this way arose the production which appears under different names among the ancients,[25] and which still exists, but only in the Latin translation of Rufinus, under the title *Recognitiones Clementis* libb. x.[26] The requirements of a much later orthodoxy gave rise to the ἐπιτομή.[27]

§ 59.

OPPOSITION AT ROME TO MONTANISM, AND THE ASIATIC TIME OF CELEBRATING EASTER.

About the time when the Clementines appeared, there was generally apparent at Rome a lively striving after unity by removing all elements whose tendency was to disturb it.

Montanism had not only obtained many friends in the western church, without giving rise to an external division,[1] but had even gained besides an important influence over the prevailing ecclesiastical principles.[2] The bishop of Rome was already on the point of entering into ecclesiastical communion with the

ful persons under the seal of secrecy; and James guarantees the secrecy by a διαμαρτυρία added, according to which those books should be made known only to tried brethren, after they had agreed by an oath to keep the secret. Comp. Hom. ii. 17, above note 8.

[25] Περίοδοι Πέτρου or Κλήμεντος (Origenes in Genesin tom. iii. c. 14), πράξεις Πέτρου (Photius bibl. cod. 112 and 113), historia Clementis (Opus imperf. in Matth. ad 24, 24), gesta Clementis, vera disputatio Petri Ap. contra falsitatem Simonis Magi (in Codd.).

[26] Schliemann's die clementin. Recognitionen eine Ueberarbeitung der Clementinen (reprinted from Pelt's theol. Mitarbeiten. Jahrg. 4 Heft. 4.) Kiel, 1843. The same author's Clementinen S. 265 ff. According to him the composition of them took place in the period between 212 and 230. But the reasons adduced in favour of Rome, as the place of writing, cannot be regarded as decisive. The Christology of the Recognitions (Schliemann S. 331) obviously points to Alexandria.

[27] Schliemann S. 334.

[1] See above § 48, note 17—19, below note 4.

[2] See above § 53, note 39.

Asiatic Montanists who had been excluded from the church of their native country, when *Praxeas*, a confessor, came from Asia to Rome (about 192) and so altered the disposition towards them, that all communion with them was renounced.[3] Thus, then, there began in the west also a controversy concerning the distinguishing doctrines of Montanism, which was conducted with violence, especially in Africa.[4] At the head of

[3] Tertull. adv. Praxean c. 1. Nam idem (Praxeas) tunc episcopum Romanum, agnoscentem jam prophetias Montani, Priscae, Maximillae, et ex ea agnitione pacem ecclesiis Asiae et Phrygiae inferentem, falsa de ipsis prophetis et ecclesiis eorum adseverando, et praecessorum ejus auctoritates defendendo, coëgit et literas pacis revocare jam emissas, et a proposito recipiendorum charismatum concessare. Victor is usually regarded as that Romish bishop (185—197); but Neander (Antignosticus S. 485) and Schwegler (Montanismus S. 250) declare themselves in favour of Eleutherus (170—185), because an incipient yielding to the Montanists does not appear like the stiff hierarchical character of Victor. That character has been inferred merely from his conduct towards the Quartodecimani. But since experience shows that those who renounce certain views, become the most violent opponents of them, Victor's violent measures against everything which appears to coincide with Montanism, may be best explained on the supposition that he was at first favourably disposed towards them. Chronology is in favour of Victor; for, by the supposition that Eleutherus was the person, there is too long an interval between the first appearance of Praxeas in Rome, and of Tertullian's, lib. adv. Praxeam, (composed according to Noesselt 204 or 205.)

[4] An important particular of it is given by Tertullian de Pudicit. c. 1: Audio etiam edictum esse propositum, et quidem peremptorium: Pontifex scilicet Maximus, Episcopus Episcoporum, edicit: ego et moechiae et fornicationis delicta poenitentia functis dimitto. cap. 5: Quid agis mollissima et humanissima disciplina? Idololatram quidem et homicidam semel damnas, moechum vero de medio excipis? comp. above § 53, note 39. According to Petavius (not. ad Epiph, haer. 59. p. 228,) it is usually assumed that that Pontifex Maximus is the Romish bishop Zephyrinus (197—217). But the appellation in question does not refer to a real, but to an usurped dignity. It points ironically to the circumstance, that the bishop who had made the regulation arrogated to himself by so doing the prerogatives of the only high-priest, Christ. Most probably the allusion is to the bishop of Carthage. Particularly important for the history of the controversy is Tertullian. lib. de velandis virginibus. In support of his demand, virgines nostras velari oportere, ex quo transitum aetatis suae fecerint, in order to set aside the argument brought against him from custom, cap. 2, Tertullian appeals to the consuetudo of the apostolic churches in Greece, and some barbarous countries: non possumus respuere consuetudinem, quam damnare non possumus, utpote non extraneam, quia non extraneorum: cum quibus scilicet communicamus jus pacis et nomen fraternitatis. Una nobis et illis fides,

the Montanist party stood *Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus*, presbyter in Carthage, and the earliest Latin ecclesiastical writer of note, a man whose modes of thought were strict and severe, of a violent character, and of a rich though somewhat too sensuous imagination. In his writings it may be seen that he developed his Montanist tendency in a way increasingly rugged, being heated more and more by controversy, *(Spiritalium contra Psychicos)*.[5] Hence others followed him in the same spirit, till at length in the west also, separate Montanist churches were formed.[6] In the mean time Montanism had

unus Deus idem Christus, eadam spes, eadem lavacri sacramenta. Semel dixerim, una ecclesia sumus. Hence this book was written before the division in the church, when both contending parties still belonged to the same church. Cap. 3 describes how the controversy sprung up from a peaceful living together, and how the parties gradually became more and more embittered. Tamen tolerabilius apud nos ad usque proxime: utrique consuetudini communicabatur. Arbitrio permissa res erat, ut quaeque voluisset aut tegi aut prostituti, sicut et nubere: quod et ipsum neque cogitur, neque prohibetur. Contenta erat veritas pacisci cum consuetudine, ut tacite sub consuetudinis nomine frueretur se vel ex parte. Sed quoniam coeperat agnitio proficere, ut per licentiam utriusque moris indicium melioris partis emergeret: statim ille adversarius bonorum multoque institutorum opus suum fecit. Ambiunt virgines hominum, adversus virgines Dei, nuda plane fronte, in temerariam audaciam excitatae, et virgines videntur.—Scandalizamur, inquiunt, quia aliae aliter incedunt: et malunt scandalizari quam provocari etc. Soon after, a complete separation took place, adv. Praxeam c. 1: Et nos quidem postea agnitio paracleti, atque defensio disjunxit a Psychicis.

[5] Accordingly, he admits of a repentance after baptism, de poenitentia c. 7 ss. On the contrary, in his treatise de pudicitia c. 16, he writes: Nemo seducat seipsum. i. e. nemo praesumat vitiatim Deo redintegrari denuo posse:—delicta ista—post lavacrum irremissibilia, although, in c. 1, he confesses that he had formerly been of another opinion. In like manner, he allows of flight under persecution, ad uxorem i. cap. 3, but rejects the sentiment in his lib. de fuga in persecutione. Comp. Hieronymus in catal. c. 53, de Tertull. Hic cum usque ad mediam aetatem presbyter Ecclesiae permansisset, invidia postea et contumeliis clericorum Romanae Ecclesiae ad Montani dogma delapsus. From the historical connection already noticed, it may be seen how this change took place. Comp. J. G. Hoffmann Tertulliani, quae supersunt, omnia in Montanismo scripta videri. Vitemb. 1738, 4. Moshemii dissertt. ad hist. eccl. pertinentt. vol. i. p. 54 note. J. A. Noesselt de vera aetate ac doctrina scriptorum quae supersunt Q. Sept. Tertulliani dissertt. iii. Hal. 1757 ss. 4, (reprinted in Ejusd. tres commentationes ad hist. eccl. pertinentes, Halae 1817, 8, p. 1 ss.). Neander's Antignosticus, Geist des Tertullianus, und Einleitung zu dessen Schriften. Berlin 1825, 8.

[6] Augustinus de haer. c. 86, relates, that in his time the remnant of the

been too deeply rooted in the western church; and now also the circumstance operated in its favour (comp. above) that its most zealous opponents, as *Praxeas*[7] and the Roman presbyter *Caius*,[8] fell into other serious errors. Thus from this time onward, Montanism was rejected in name even in the western church. But all Montanist elements were by no means expelled from that church.[9] Not only do we find remaining that strictness

Tertullianists in Carthage had returned to the Catholic church. Hence they were called Montanists in Carthage also, after their leader. But they neither gave themselves this appellation, nor can it be inferred from the difference of names, as the Praedestinatus haer. 86 does, that the followers of Tertullian had formed a peculiar sect separated from the other Montanists.

[7] See below § 60.

[8] A contemporary of Zephyrinus according to Eusebius h. e. ii. 25. Fragments of his διάλογος πρὸς Πρόκλον (τῆς κατὰ Φρύγας αἱρέσεως ὑπερμαχοῦντα Euseb. vi. 20,) are found in Eusebius ii. 25, iii. 28, 31. Comp. Photii bibl. cod. 48. Routh reliqu. sacr. vol. ii. p. 1 ss. He attributed the doctrine of the millennium and the Apocalypse to Cerinthus. Euseb. iii. 28, comp. Lücke's Einleit. in d. Offenb. Joh. S. 307.

[9] It is a remarkable phenomenon that the Montanists, Perpetua and Felicitas, who were martyred in Carthage in 202, and their Acta composed by a Montanist (see apud Ruinart and in Münteri primordia eccl. Afric. p. 227 ss.), were always highly valued in the African church. cf. Augustini sermo i. in natali Perpetuae et Felicitatis. The Montanist character of the memoirs is satisfactorily shown by Valesius (Acta SS. Perpet. et Felicit. Paris 1664, 8, in the preface), Sam Basnage (Annales polit. Eccl. t. ii. p. 224 ss.), and by Th. Ittig (diss. de haeresiarchis aevi apostol. et apostolico proximi. Lips. 1690, 4to, sect. ii. c. 13, § 28). Even Jos. Aug. Orsi diss. apolog. pro SS. Perpetuae et Felicitatis orthodoxia adv. S. Basnagium. Florent. 1728, 4, admits the Montanist principles of the author of the Acta. Comp. particularly Act. cap. 1: Viderint, qui unam virtutem Spiritus unius Sancti pro aetatibus judicent temporum: cum majora reputanda sint novitiora quaeque, ut novissimiora secundum exuberationem gratiae in ultima saeculi spatia decreta. In novissimis enim diebus, dicit Dominus, effundam de Spiritu meo super omnem carnem, &c. (Joel ii. 28, and Act. ii. 17). Itaque et nos, qui sicut prophetias, ita et visiones nōvas pariter repromissas et agnoscimus et honoramus, &c. cap. 4. Pastor (Christus)—de caseo quod mulgebat dedit mihi quasi buccellam, et ego accepi junctis manibus, et manducavi, et universi circumstantes dixerunt Amen (cf. § 48, not. 22). The fact, that those Montanising martyrs should have been constantly considered as members of the Catholic church, is accounted for by supposing, that although at the time of their death the controversy between the two parties had begun, yet the separation had not taken place. But, undoubtedly, the Montanist spirit must have been fostered in the church by the high estimation in which such writings were held.

and tendency to lay stress on external rules of piety,[10] but, what is still more striking, even the writings of the Montanist *Tertullian* († about 220) were always valued very highly, and became the model of succeeding Latin ecclesiastical writers.[11]

With the rejection of Montanism in Rome was probably connected *Victor's* opposition to the Asiatic mode of celebrating easter (see above).[12] He called upon the bishops of Asia Minor

[10] For instance, the principle which was maintained in the African church till the time of Cyprian (Tertull. de pudic. c. 12), quod neque idololatriae neque sanguini pax ab Ecclesiis redditur. See above note 4, below § 71. Neander's Antignosticus, S. 262. The Spanish church, which seems to have adopted the African as its model, expressed the same view in its greatest strictness as late as the Concil. Illiberitanum (about the year of our Lord 305). This council ordains, with regard to those who have defiled themselves with such crimes as idolatry, magic, adultery, incest, placuit nec in fine communionem accipere (can. 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 10, &c.—The error against which Cyprian Ep. 63 ad Caecilium inveighs, quod aliquis existimet, sequendam esse quorundam consuetudinem, si qui in praeteritum in calice Dominico aquam solam offerendam putaverint, may also have sprung from Montanist asceticism.

[11] Hieron. catal. c. 53: numquam Cyprianum absque Tertulliani lectione unum diem praeterisse: ac sibi (notario) crebro dicere, Da magistrum, Tertullianum videlicet, significans. His works, written from 197—211, are, 1. Against unbelievers, Apologeticus adv. gentes (written about 198, Moshemii de aetate apologetici Tert. comm. in his Dissertt. ad hist. eccl. pert. i. 1. Hefele Tertullian als Apologet, in the Tübingen theol. Quartalschr. 1838, i. 30), libri ii. ad nationes, de testimonio animae, ad Scapulam, adv. Judaeos. 2. Against heretics, adv. Praxeam, adv. Marcionem libb. v., adv. Valentinianos, de praescriptione haereticorum, adv. Hermogenem. 3. Ascetic writings, the later of them expressly against the Psychics: ad Martyres, de spectaculis, de idololatria, de oratione, de baptismo, libb. ii. ad uxorem,—de corona militis, libb. ii. de cultu feminarum, de fuga in persecutione, de patientia, de virginibus velandis, de jejuniis, de pudicitia cael. Comp. the works quoted in note 5. Bähr's christl. römische Theologie S. 15. Möhler's Patrologie S. 701.—Ed. Nic. Rigaltius. Paris 1641. Rep. Ph. Priorius. Par. 1695, fol. J. S. Semler. Hal. 1770—76, 6 Bde. 8. E. F. Leopold pp. iv. Lips. 1839—41, 8.

[12] Some details relating to this matter are given, perhaps, in the Appendix ad Tertull. de praescript. haeret. c. 53: Est praeterea his omnibus etiam Blastus accedens, qui latenter Judaismum vult introducere. Pascha enim dicit non aliter custodiendum esse, nisi secundum legem Moysi quartadecima mensis. But this Blastus appeared in Rome (Euseb. v. 15), and Irenaeus wrote to him an ἐπιστολὴ περὶ σχίσματος (Euseb. v. 20). From Eusebius, it is clear that he did not entirely coincide in sentiment with the Gnosticising Florinus; he appears to have been an Ultra-Montanist. Comp. Pacianus (bishop of Barcelona about 370) Epist. i. ad Sympron. in Gallandii biblioth. vii. 257: Phryges plu-

(about 196) to adopt the custom of the west on this point, and after their refusal, when he had been assured of the assent of the bishops in Palestine, Pontus, Gaul, and Corinth, broke off church communion with them.[13] Several bishops, however, and Irenaeus himself among them, admonished him on account of his too great haste;[14] peace was again restored, and both parties continued undisturbed in the observance of their own customs till the council of Nice.[15]

§ 60.

MONARCHIANS.

Walch's Ketzerhist. i. 537, ii. 3. Martini's Gesch. des Dogma v. d. Gotthei Christi in den vier ersten Jahrh. Rostock Th. i. 1800, 8. S. 128 ff. F. Schleiermacher uber den Gegensatz zwischen der Sabellianischen und der Athanasianischen Vorstellung von der Trinität (in Schleiermacher's, de Wette's, und Lücke's theol. Zeitschrift. Heft 3, Berlin 1822. S. 295 ff.) [translated into English with notes by Prof. Stuart, in the American Biblical Repository for April 1835.] Neander's KG. i. ii. 991. L. Lange's Gesch. u. Lehrbegriff d. Unitarier vor der nic. Synode (Beiträge zur ältesten Kirchengesch. Bd. 2.) Leipzig 1831. 8. The same author's Lehre d. Unitarier v,

rimis nituntur auctoritatibus, nam puto et Graecus Blastus ipsorum est. The Asiatic Montanists have always retained the mode of celebrating easter which he advocates. See Anonymi Orat. vii. in Pascha in Chrÿsostomi opp. ed. Montfaucon. t. viii. App. p. 276. Schwegler's Montanismus S. 251.

[13] Euseb. h. e. v. 23—25.

[14] Euseb. v. 24: *ἀλλ' οὐ πᾶσί γε τοῖς ἐπισκόποις ταῦτ' ἠρέσκετο. ἀντιπαρακελεύονται δῆτα αὐτῷ, τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης καὶ τῆς πρὸς τοὺς πλησίον ἑνώσεως καὶ ἀγάπης φρονεῖν· φέρονται δὲ καὶ αἱ τούτων φωναί, πληκτικώτερον καθαπτομένων τοῦ Βίκτορος. Ἐν οἷς καὶ ὁ Εἰρηναῖος ἐκ προσώπου ὢν ἡγεῖτο κατὰ τὴν Γαλλίαν ἀδελφῶν ἐπισκοπὰς,—τῷ γε μὴν Βίκτορι προσηκόντως, ὡς μὴ ἀποκόπτοι ἕτερα παραινεῖ.* Then follow fragments from this letter. Irenaeus expresses his opinion of such disputes very plainly in the Fragm. iii. ed. Pfaff. *Ἔταξαν οἱ Ἀπόστολοι, μὴ δεῖν ἡμᾶς κρίνειν τινὰ ἐν βρώσει καὶ ἐν πόσει [καὶ ἐν μέρει] ἑορτῆς ἢ νεομηνίας ἢ σαββάτων. Πόθεν οὖν ταῦται αἱ μάχαι; πόθεν τὰ σχίσματα; ἑορτάζομεν, ἀλλ' ἐν ζύμῃ κακίας καὶ πονηρίας, τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ διαῤῥίπτοντες, καὶ τὰ ἐκτὸς τηροῦμεν, ἵνα τὰ κρείττονα τὴν πίστιν καὶ ἀγάπην ἀποβάλλωμεν. Ταύτας οὖν ἑορτὰς καὶ νηστείας ἀπαρέσκειν τῷ κυρίῳ ἐκ τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων ἠκούσαμεν.*

[15] According to Athanasius de Syn. c. 5, it was one reason for summoning the council of Nice, that *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Συρίας, καὶ Κιλικίας, καὶ Μεσοποταμίας ἐχώλευον περὶ τὴν ἑορτὴν, καὶ μετὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐποίουν τὸ Πάσχα.* Cf. Euseb. de vita Const. iii. c. 5.

heil. Geiste, in Illgen's Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol. iii. i. 65. Baur's die christl. Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit u. Menschwerdung Goftes i. 243. G. A. Meier's die Lehre v. d. Trinitat. (Hamb. u. Gotha 1844) i. 74.

The doctrine which regarded the divine in Christ as a personality not distinct from the Father had subsisted without opposition in the second century in addition to the emanation-doctrine,[1] since it was capable of being united with it in the confession which alone was important in relation to the faith, viz. that God is in Christ. It found a welcome reception particularly among the Antimontanists, who were averse to all sensuous ideas of Godhead;[2] and on this very account was first combated by the zealous Montanist Tertullian, in his treatise against Praxeas. In the controversies which extend from this time onward through the third century, and terminate in the ecclesiastical rejection of this doctrine, it developed itself more definitely in different forms, which may be reduced to two great classes. The one looked upon the divine in Christ as continually teaching and acting through him; the other looked upon it as acting only on the human person, so that according to the former, the entire agency of Christ was a divine thing derived from God; according to the latter, a human thing derived from the same source.[3] To the first class belonged *Praxeas*,[4] who, notwith-

[1] See above § 52, note 12.

[2] See § 48, note 14, 15. Neander's KG. I. II. 1003, F. A. Heinichen de Alogis, Theodotianis, atque Artemonitis. Lips. 1829, 8. Epiphan. haer. liv. c. 1, calls Theodotus *ἀπόσπασμα ἐκ τῆς Ἀλόγου αἱρέσεως, τῆς ἀρνουμένης τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγέλιον, καὶ τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ ἐν ἀρχῇ ὄντα θεὸν λόγον.*

[3] Novatianus de trinitate c. 30: Tam illi, qui Jesum Christum ipsum Deum patrem dicunt, quam etiam illi, qui hominem illum tantummodo esse voluerunt, erroris sui et perversitatis origines et causas inde rapuerunt, quia, cum animadverterent, scriptum esse, quod unus sit Deus, non aliter putaverunt, istam tenere se posse sententiam, nisi aut hominem tantum Christum, aut certe Deum patrem putarent esse credendum. In like manner Origen comm. in Joh. tom. ii. c. 2, divides the *εὐλαβουμένους δύο ἀναγορεῦσαι θεούς, καὶ παρα τοῦτο περιπίπτοντας ψευδέσι καὶ ἀσεβέσι δόγμασιν* into two classes, *ἤτοι ἀρνουμένους ἰδιότητα υἱοῦ ἑτέραν παρὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς, ὁμολογοῦντας θεὸν εἶναι τὸν μέχρι ὀνόματος παρ' αὐτοῖς υἱὸν προσαγορευόμενον, ἢ ἀρνουμένους τὴν θεότητα τοῦ υἱοῦ, τιθέντας δὲ αὐτοῦ τὴν ἰδιότητα, καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν κατὰ περιγραφὴν τυγχάνουσαν ἑτέραν τοῦ πατρός.*

[4] Tertullianus adv. Praxean c. 1. Nam iste primus ex Asia hoc genus perversitatis intulit homo.—Duo negotia diaboli Praxeas Romae procuravit: prophetiam expulit, et haeresin intulit, Paracletum fugavit et patrem crucifixit.—c. 20, Nam sicut in veteribus nihil aliud tenent

standing the opposition of Tertullian, appears to have been unmolested in Rome on account of his doctrine.[5] But *Theodotus* (ὁ σκυτεύς) who had come to Rome from Byzantium about the same time, was excluded from church-communion by Victor, when he declared Christ to be a mere man; and his disciples (Theodotus ὁ τραπεζίτης, Asclepiades, Natalius, Confessor) continued to exist in Rome for some time separated from the church.[6] By means of these Theodotians, however, the Monar-

quam: Ego deus et alius praeter me non est (Es. 45, 5): ita in Evangelio responsionem domini ad Philippum tuentur: Ego et pater unum sumus, et: Qui me viderit videt et patrem, et: Ego in patre et pater in me (Joh. 10, 30, 14, 9, 10,). His tribus capitulis totum instrumentum utriusque testamenti volunt cedere.—c. 3. Itaque duos et tres jam jactitant a nobis praedicari, se vero unius Dei cultores praesumunt.—Monarchiam, inquiunt, tenemus (c. 10, vanissimi isti Monarchiani).—c. 5. Duos unum volunt esse, ut idem Pater et filius habeatur.—c. 2, Itaque post tempus pater natus, et pater passus: ipse Deus, dominus omnipotens, Jesus Christus praedicatur. On the other hand, c. 27, aeque in una persona utrumque distinguunt, patrem et filium, dicentes filium carnem esse, id est hominem, i. e. Jesum: patrem autem spiritum, i. e. Deum, i.e. Christum, and c. 29. Ergo, inquis, et nos eadem ratione dicentes patrem, qua vos filium, non blasphemamus in Dominum Deum: non enim ex divina sed ex humana substantia mortuum dicimus. Baur (Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit i. 246) and Meier (Lehre v. d. Trinitat i. 77) are of opinion that Praxeas held the view that God connected himself immediately with the flesh, without the medium of a rational human soul. But Tertullian in express terms explains carnem by hominem; and when Praxeas said, filium carnem esse, he could not possibly declare a body animated by a mere ψυχη to be filius Dei.—Comp. Neander's Antignosticus, S. 481.

[5] Tertull. adv. Prax. 1. Denique caverat pristinum doctor de emendatione sua: et manet chirographum apud Psychicos, apud quos tunc gesta res est: exinde silentium. App. l. de praescr. 53: post hos omnes etiam Praxeas quidam haeresin introduxit, quam Victorinus (Victor?) corroborare curavit. cf. not. 7.

[6] Comp. the extracts from the anonymous work against Artemon apud Euseb. v. 28, which designates Theodotus as the πρῶτον εἰπόντα ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν Χριστόν. Append. l. de praescr. 53: Ex Spiritu quidem Sancto natum, ex virgine, sed hominem solitarium atque nudum, nullo alio prae ceteris nisi sola justitiae auctoritate. Alter post hunc Theodotus (trapezita) haereticus erupit, qui et ipse introduxit alteram sectam, et ipsum hominem Christum—inferiorem esse quam Melchisedech, eo quod dictum sit de Christo: Tu es sacerdos in aeternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech (Hebr. 7, 21). Nam illum Melchisedech praecipuae gratiae coelestem esse virtutem: eo, quod agat Christus pro hominibus, deprecator et advocatus ipsorum factus, Melchisedech facere pro coelestibus angelis atque virtutibus. (Melchisedeciani). According to Theo-

chian doctrine generally became so notorious, that *Artemon (Artemas)* under bishop Zephyrinus, although he did not agree with the Theodotians, was included in the same class with them, and attacked in various writings.[7] Hence this theory was rendered suspicious everywhere, even in Asia where it took its rise; and *Noetus* was excommunicated in Smyrna (about 230) on account of his doctrine, which harmonised with that of Praxeas.[8] On the other hand, Origen succeeded in drawing off *Beryllus*, bishop of *Bostra*, from that view, at a council held in that place, in 244 A.D.[9] *Sabellius*, presbyter in Ptolemais (250

doret (haer. fab. comp. 2, 5,) even ὁ σμικρὸς Λαβύρινθος accused them of corrupting the Holy Scriptures.

[7] From the σπούδασμα κατὰ τῆς Ἀρτέμωνος αἱρέσεως extracts are given in Euseb. v. 28, in which Artemon, without a clearer explanation of his doctrine, is compared with Theodotus. But the Artemonites asserted, l. c., τοὺς μὲν προτέρους ἅπαντας καὶ αὐτοὺς τοὺς ἀποστόλους παρειληφέναι τε καὶ δεδιδαχέναι ταῦτα, ἃ νῦν οὗτοι λέγουσι· καὶ τετηρῆσθαι τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ κηρύγματος μέχρι τῶν Βίκτορος χρόνων,—ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ διαδόχου αὐτοῦ Ζεφυρίνου παρακεχάραχθαι τὴν ἀλήθειαν. According to these extracts they must have propounded a doctrine different from that of Theodotus, who was excommunicated by Victor, and such a doctrine too as might be reconciled with the earlier doctrine of the Roman church taken in an indefinite sense. In the same work, § 5, they are reproached with their dialectic tendency, (οὐ τί αἱ θεῖαι λέγουσι γραφαὶ ζητοῦντες, ἀλλ' ὁποῖον σχῆμα συλλογισμοῦ εἰς τὴν τῆς ἀθεότητος εὑρεθῇ σύστασιν, φιλοπόνως ἀσκοῦντες), and with their preference for Aristotle and Theophrastus. Theodoret (haer. fab. comp. 2, 5) gives extracts from the σμικρὸς Λαβύρινθος, written against Theodotus and Artemon, which some falsely ascribe to Origen. When Nicephorus (hist. eccles. iv. 21) looks upon that σπούδασμα of Eusebius as identical with the Λαβύρινθος of Theodoret, and when Photius (cod. 48) makes Caius to be the author of both works, they advance nothing but conjectures.

[8] Theodoret. haer. fab. comp. iii. 3, names Epigonus and Cleomenes as Noetus's predecessors. His doctrine: ἕνα φασὶν εἶναι θεὸν καὶ πατέρα, τῶν ὅλων δημιουργόν· ἀφανῆ μὲν ὅταν ἐθέλῃ, φαινόμενον δὲ ἡνίκα ἂν βούληται· καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἀόρατον εἶναι καὶ ὁρώμενον, καὶ γεννητὸν καὶ ἀγέννητον· ἀγέννητον μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς, γεννητὸν δὲ ὅτε ἐκ παρθένου γεννηθῆναι ἠθέλησε· ἀπαθῆ καὶ ἀθάνατον, καὶ πάλιν αὖ παθητὸν καὶ θνητόν. ἀπαθὴς γὰρ ὢν, φησὶ, τὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ πάθος ἐθελήσας ὑπέμεινε. τοῦτον καὶ Υἱὸν ὀνομάζουσι καὶ Πατέρα, πρὸς τὰς χρείας τοῦτο κἀκεῖνο καλούμενον. He is opposed by Hippolytus contra haeresin Noëti [ed. Fabricii t. ii. p. 5], which is transcribed by Epiphanius haer. 57, comp. note 9.

[9] Euseb. vi. 33. His doctrine was: τὸν σωτῆρα καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν μὴ προϋφεστάναι κατ' ἰδίαν οὐσίας περιγραφὴν πρὸ τῆς εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἐπιδημίας· μηδὲ μὴν θεότητα ἰδίαν ἔχειν, ἀλλ' ἐμπολιτευομένην αὐτῷ μόνην τὴν πατρικήν. Comp. Origenis fragm. ex libro in epist. ad Titum (from the apology of Pamphilus, Origenis Opp. ed Lommatzsch v. 287): Sed et eos, qui hominem dicunt Dominum Jesum praecognitum et praedestinatum, qui

—260) renewed it in a form still farther developed.[10] Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, endeavoured in vain to refute him by

ante adventum carnalem substantialiter et proprie non extiterit, sed quod homo natus Patris solam in se habuerit deitatem, ne illos quidem sine periculo est ecclesiae numero sociari: sicut et illos, qui superstitiose magis, quam religiose, uti ne videantur duos deos dicere, neque rursum negare Salvatoris deitatem, unam eandemque subsistentiam Patris ac Filii asseverant, i.e., duo quidem nomina secundum diversitatem causarum recipientem, unam tamen ὑπόστασιν subsistere, i.e., unam personam duobus nominibus subjacentem, que latine Patripassiani appellantur. The first opinion is that of Beryllus, the second that of Noetus. C. Ullmanni de Beryllo Bostreno ejusque doctrina comm. Hamb. 1835, 4. (in Halle Christmas programm).

[10] His doctrine according to Basilius Epist. 210: τὸν αὐτὸν θεὸν ἕνα τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ [τῇ ὑποστάσει Ep. 214] ὄντα, πρὸς τὰς ἑκάστοτε παραπιπτούσας χρείας μεταμορφούμενον (μετασχηματιζόμενον Ep. 235, προσωποποιούμενον Ep. 214), νῦν μὲν ὡς πατέρα, νῦν δὲ ὡς υἱόν, νῦν δὲ ὡς πνεῦμα ἅγιον διαλέγεσθαι. cf. Athanas. c. Arian. Or. iv. 11: τὸν θεὸν σιωπῶντα μὲν ἀνενέργητον, λαλοῦντα δὲ ἰσχύειν). Theodoret. haer. fab. comp. ii. 9, ἐν μὲν τῇ παλαιᾷ ὡς πατέρα νομοθετῆσαι, ἐν δὲ τῇ καινῇ ὡς υἱὸν ἐνανθρωπῆσαι· ὡς πνεῦμα δὲ ἅγιον τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἐπιφοιτῆσαι.—(τρία πρόσωπα). Pseudo-Greg. Thaumat., ἡ κατὰ μέρος πίστις (in Ang. Maji Scriptt. vett. nova collectio vii. 1, 171): Ἀποφεύγομεν τὸν Σαβέλλιον λέγοντα τὸν αὐτὸν πατέρα, τὸν αὐτὸν υἱόν· Πατέρα μὲν γὰρ λέγει εἶναι τὸν λαλοῦντα, υἱὸν δὲ τὸν λόγον ἐν τῷ πατρὶ μένοντα, καὶ κατὰ καιρὸν τῆς δημιουργίας φαινόμενον, ἔπειτα μετὰ τὴν ἁπάντων πλήρωσιν τῶν πραγμάτων εἰς θεὸν ἀνατρέχοντα. Τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος λέγει. Athanas. c. Arian. Or. iv. 12: ἡ μονὰς πλατυνθεῖσα γέγονε τριάς. Ib. 13: συστέλλεσθαι καὶ πάλιν ἐκτείνεσθαι τὸν θεὸν, respecting this ἔκτασις καὶ συστολή see the Clementinen und Philo above § 58, not. 13). Ib. 25: ὥσπερ διαιρέσεις χαρισμάτων εἰσί, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα, οὕτω καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὁ αὐτὸς μέν ἐστι, πλατύνεται δὲ εἰς υἱὸν καὶ πνεῦμα. Arii epist. ad Alexandrum Alex. ap. Epiphan. haeres. 69: Σαβέλλιος τὴν μονάδα διαιρῶν υἱοπάτορα εἶπεν. (Gregorius Nyss. contra Arium et Sabellium in Ang. Maji Scriptt. vett. nova coll. viii. ii. 1: οἱ κατὰ Σαβέλλιον—ἀναιρεῖν μὲν πειρῶνται τὴν ὑπόστασιν τοῦ υἱοῦ, αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν πατέρα ἕνα ὄντα δυσὶν ὀνόμασι γεραίροντα οἰόμενοι, υἱοπάτορα προσαγορεύουσιν). According to Epiphanius haer. lxii. 1, he compared the Godhead to the sun, ὄντι μὲν ἐν μιᾷ ὑποστάσει, τρεῖς δὲ ἔχοντι τὰς ἐνεργείας, namely, τὸ τῆς περιφερείας σχῆμα, or τὸ εἶδος πάσης τῆς ὑποστάσεως, τὸ φωτιστικόν, and τὸ θάλπον. The Monas is the divine essence in itself, in its concealed state, which reveals itself in the trias, while it assumes three characters (πρόσωπα) according to the nature of the revelations. These three πρόσωπα are ὁ πατήρ, ὁ υἱός, τὸ πνεῦμα. The Logos is never called a second prosopon, but it is the Logos which became man, and, as such, took the name ὁ υἱός (Athanas. c. Arian. Or. iv. 22: ἐν ἀρχῇ μὲν λόγοι ἁπλῶς· ὅτε δὲ ἐνηνθρώπησε, τότε ὠνομάσθαι υἱόν). Hence Baur's opinion (Dreieinigkeit i. 261) is very probable that, in the sense of Sabellius, the Logos, in opposition to the Monas, is the manifested God generally, and that the three πρόσωπα are to be considered as the changing forms

personal interviews and letters, and in unfolding antagonist views went so far as to make new assertions equally objectionable. Sabellians were found so late as the fourth century, in Rome and Mesopotamia. Still greater offence was given by *Paul of Samosata*, who, being at the same time bishop of Antioch (from 260) and holding a civil office,[11] exhibited a vanity and love of display hitherto unexampled in a christian bishop. While he maintained with strictness the unity of God, he declared Jesus to be a man begotten by the Holy Spirit, on whom the Divine wisdom descending exerted its influence in a peculiar manner.[12] Three councils were held in Antioch on his account.

of the Logos. If, in some accounts, the divine essence is styled ὁ πατήρ generally, this may have been done by Sabellius, since, according to the Catholic doctrine, ὁ πατήρ may even designate the triune God οὐσιωδῶς. Finally, with regard to the question whether Sabellius considered the πρόσωπον of the Son as a transitory appearance united to the earthly existence of Jesus, (as Baur, l. c. p. 266, thinks), or whether he believed that the person of Christ should cease to be only with the final consummation, (according to Neander i. ii. 1031), Gregory of Nyssa decides in favour of the former view, contra Arium et Sabellium in Ang. Maji coll. viii. ii. 4: Οἱ δὲ κατὰ Σαβέλλιον—εἰς τὴν μεγίστην τῆς ἀσεβείας ἐκπεπτώκασι πλάνην, οἰόμενοι, διὰ μὲν λειποταξίαν ἀνθρωπίνην προελθηλυθέναι τὸν υἱὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς προσκαίρως· αὖθις δὲ μετὰ τὴν διόρθωσιν τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων πλημμελημάτων ἀναλελυκότα ἐνδύναι τε καί ἀναμεμίχθαι τῷ πατρί.

[11] He was a Ducenarius, Euseb. vii. 30. We must not here think of the Ducenarii whom Augustus created as the fourth decuria of knights, so called because they must have property to the amount of ducena sestertia (Sueton. Octav. c. 32), but the ducenarii procuratores, officers of a higher rank, who had so much yearly revenue, to whom Claudius granted the ornamenta consularia (Sueton. Claud. c. 24), and who still continued under Constantine (Cod. Justin. x. 19, 1).

[12] His history is given in Euseb. vii. 27—30. Here also, cap. 30, is found the historical part of the circular letter of the last council of Antioch which was held against him. Doctrinal fragments of the same are given in Leontii Byz. contra Nestor. et Eutych. lib. iii. in the Greek original from a Bodleian MS. apud J. G. Ehrlich diss. de erroribus Pauli Samos. Lips. 1745. 4. p. 23. Among other original documents put together in the collection of councils (apud Mansi i. 1033), the Epist. Episcoporum ad Paulum is still the most trust-worthy. The others are partly suspicious, partly spurious beyond a doubt, such as the epistle of Dionysius Alex. ad Paulum.—Fragments of Paul himself are found in the Contestatio ad Clerum Constantinop. in the acts of the council of Ephesus apud Mansi v. 393, ap. Leontius l. c. In Greek from a Paris MS. in J. G. Feuerlini diss. de haeresi Pauli Sam. Gotting. 1741. 4. p. 10, and in Justiniani Imp. lib. contra Monophysitas in Ang. Maji nova collect. vii. i. 299: The texts contain much that agrees word for word, and may be supplemented and improved by each other. Besides frag-

At the last of them (269), he was convicted of heresy, by Malchion, his opinion having been hitherto disguised under ambiguous expressions, and deposed from his office.[13] But his newly

ments of Paul ἐκ τῶν πρὸς Σαβιανὸν (or Σαβῖνον) λόγων from a Clermont MS. in Feuerlini diss. p. 15, more correctly from a Vatican MS. in Ang. Maji nova coll. vii. i. 68.—The doctrine of Paul was, according to Epiphanius haer. lxvi. 1: ἐν Θεῷ ἀεί ὄντα τὸν αὐτοῦ Λόγον, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ, ὥσπερ ἐν ἀνθρώπου καρδίᾳ ὁ ἴδιος λόγος· μὴ εἶναι δὲ τὸν υἱὸν ἐνυπόστατον, ἀλλὰ ἐν αὐτῷ Θεῷ (ἐπιστήμην ἀνυπόστατον, Epist. Episc. ad Paul)—ἐλθόντα δὲ τὸν Λόγον καὶ ἐνοικήσαντα ἐν Ἰησοῦ ἀνθρώπῳ ὄντι (Epist. synodi Antioch. apud Leontius: οὐ συγγεγενῆσθαι τῷ ἀνθρωπίνῳ τὴν σοφίαν, ὡς ἡμεῖς πιστεύομεν, οὐσιωδῶς, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ποιότητα).—οὐ φάσκει δὲ οὗτος κατὰ τὸν Νόητον τὸν Πατέρα πεποιθέναι, ἀλλὰ φησί, ἐλθὼν ὁ Λόγος ἐνήργησε μόνος, καὶ ἀνῆλθε πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα. Fragments of Paul's writings: Συνῆλθεν ὁ λόγος τῷ ἐκ Δαβὶδ γεγενημένῳ, ὅς ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου· καὶ τοῦτον μὲν ἤνεγκεν ἡ παρθένος διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου, ἐκεῖνον δὲ τὸν λόγον ἐγέννησεν ὁ Θεὸς ἄνευ παρθένου καὶ ἄνευ τινὸς οὐδενὸς ὄντος, πλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ οὕτως ὑπέστη ὁ λόγος.—Ἄνθρωπος χρίεται, λόγος οὐ χρίεται·—καὶ γὰρ ὁ λόγος μείζων ἦν τοῦ Χριστοῦ· Χριστὸς γὰρ διὰ σοφίας μέγας ἐγένετο· τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς σοφίας μὴ καθέλωμεν. Λόγος μὲν γὰρ ἄνωθεν, Ἰησοῦς δὲ Χριστὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐντεῦθεν (Epist. Syn. Antioch. apud Euseb. vii. 30, Ἰ. Χρ. κάτωθεν). Μαρία τὸν λόγον οὐκ ἔτεκε,—τὸν λόγον ὑπεδέξατο,—ἔτεκεν ἄνθρωπον ἡμῖν ἴσον, κρεῖττονα δὲ κατὰ πάντα, ἐπειδὴ ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου.—(Ἡ σοφία) ἐν προφήταις ἦν, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐν Μωσῇ· καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς κυρίοις, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ, ὡς ἐν ναῷ Θεοῦ. Ex Pauli sermonibus ad Sabinum: Τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι χρισθεὶς προσηγορεύθη Χριστὸς, πάσχων κατὰ φύσιν, θαυματουργῶν κατὰ χάριν· τῷ γὰρ ἀτρέπτῳ τῆς γνώμης ὁμοιωθεὶς τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ μείνας καθαρὸς ἁμαρτίας ἠνώθη αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐνηργήθη ποιεῖσθαι τὴν τῶν θαυμάτων δυναστείαν, ἐξ ὧν μίαν αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν πρὸς τῇ θελήσει ἐνέργειαν ἔχων δειχθεὶς, λυτρωτὴς τοῦ γένους καὶ σωτὴρ ἐχρημάτισεν.—Ἅγιος καὶ δίκαιος γέγονεν ἡμῶν ὁ σωτὴρ, ἀγῶνι καὶ πόνῳ τῆς τοῦ προπάτορος ἡμῶν κρατήσας ἁμαρτίας· οἷς κατορθώσας τὴν ἀρετὴν, συνήφθη τῷ Θεῷ, μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν βούλησιν καὶ ἐνέργειαν ταῖς τῶν ἀγαθῶν προκοπαῖς ἐσχηκώς· ἦν ἀδιαίρετον φυλάξας, τὸ ὄνομα κληροῦται τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα, στοργῆς ἔπαθλον αὐτῷ χαρισθέν.—Μὴ θαυμάσῃς, ὅτι μίαν μετὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν θέλησιν εἶχεν ὁ σωτήρ· ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ φύσις μίαν τῶν πολλῶν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ὑπάρχουσαν φανεροῖ τὴν οὐσίαν, οὕτως ἡ σχέσις τῆς ἀγάπης μίαν τῶν πολλῶν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ὑπάρχουσαν φανεροῖ τὴν οὐσίαν, οὕτως ἡ σχέσις τῆς ἀγάπης μίαν τῶν πολλῶν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐργάζεται θέλησιν διὰ μιᾶς καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς φανερουμένης εὐαρεστήσεως.—Τὰ κρατούμενα τῷ λόγῳ τῆς φύσεως οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἔπαινον· τὰ δὲ σχέσει φιλίας κρατούμενα ὑπεραίνετα, μίᾳ καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ κρατούμενα, διὰ μιᾶς καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐνεργείας βεβαιούμενα, καὶ τῆς κατ' ἐπαύξησιν οὐδέποτε παυομένης κινήσεως. Καθ' ἣν τῷ Θεῷ συναφθεὶς ὁ σωτὴρ οὐδέποτε δέχεται μερισμὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, μίαν αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχων θέλησιν καὶ ἐνέργειαν ἀεὶ κινουμένην τῇ φανερώσει τῶν ἀγαθῶν.—J. B. Schwab diss. de Pauli Samos. vita atque doctrina. Herbipoli 1839, 8. Baur i. 293. Neander i. ii. 1035. Meier's Lehre v. d. Trinität i. 115.

[13] It was established by the council: μὴ εἶναι ὁμοούσιον τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ πατρὶ, first mentioned in a letter of the Semiarians about 358, allowed

elected successor bishop Domnus, could not take possession of his office until Zenobia the patroness of Paul had been defeated by Aurelian (272).[14] The party of Paul (Samosateniani, Paulianistae) existed till the fourth century.[15]

§ 61.

MANICHAEANS.

SPECIAL SOURCES: Archelai (bishop of Cascar about 278.) Acta disputationis cum Manete [1] (first in L. A. Zaccagnii collectaneis monumentor. vet. eccl. Graecae et Lat. Romae 1698. 4., then in J. A. Fabricii ed. opp. Hippolyti vol. ii., Gallandii bibl. Patr. Vol. iii. Routh reliqu. sacr. vol. iv. p. 119 ss.)—Titi Bostrensis (about 360) libb. iv. contra Manichaeos (in Henr. Canisii lection. antiquis, ed. Basnage T. i.). — Augustini Hipponensis contra Fortunatum, contra Adamantum, contra Faustum libb. 33, de actis cum Felice Man. libb. 2, and other writings collected in the 8th vol. of the Benedictine edition.

WORKS. Is. de Beausobre hist. crit. de Manichée et du Manicheisme. Amst. 1734. 39. 2 Bd. 4. J. L. Moshemii comm. de rebus Christian. ante Constantin. M. p. 728 ss. Walch's Ketzerhist Th. 1. S. 685 ff. J. S. Semler's Einleitung zu Baumgarten's Untersuch. theologischer Streitigkeiten, Bd. 1. Halle 1762. 4. S. 266 ff. K. A. Freih. v. Reichlin Meldegg die Theologie d. Magiers Manes und ihr Ursprung. Frankf. a. M. 1825. 8. Manichaeorum indulgentias cum brevi totius Manichaeismi adumbratione e fontibus descripsit A. F. V. de Wegnern. Lips. 1827. 8. Neander's Kirchengesh. i, ii, 824. (Comp. my review of the last three works in the theol. Studien u. Kritiken. Bd. I. Heft 3. S. 599 ff.). Das manich. Religionssystem nach den Quellen neu untersucht u. entwickelt von Dr. F. Chr. Baur, Tübingen 1831. 8. (comp. Scheckenburger's review in the theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1833. iii. 875).

by Athanasius de synod. 43. Hilarius de synod. 86. Basilius epist. 52. On the other side, Prudentius Maranus diss. sur les Semiariens (in Voigtii bibl. hist. haeresiologicae t. ii. p. 159), Feuerlini diss. Dei filium patri esse ὁμοούσιον, antiqui ecclesiae doctores in Conc. Ant. utrum negarint. Goetting. 1755, 4. Döllinger's KG. i. i. 269.—Schleiermacher l. c. 387 note thinks that Sabellius first used that expression. That it certainly occurs in the Sabellian controversy is shown below § 64, note 8.

[14] A remarkable command of Aurelian, Euseb. vii. 30, 9: τούτοις νείμαι τὸν οἶκον, οἷς ἂν οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν καὶ τὴν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν ἐπίσκοποι τοῦ δόγματος ἐπιστέλλοιεν.

[15] The most usual names for all those who asserted τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα were, according to Athanas. de Synodis c. 7, Πατροπασσιανοὶ μὲν παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις, Σαβελλιανοὶ δὲ παρ' ἡμῖν.

[1] Fragments of the Greek original are given by Epiphanius (haer. 66). Respecting their spuriousness, see Beausobre i. p. 129 ff. Yet even by Jerome they were regarded as authentic (catal. c. 72). Cf. Fabricii bibl. Graeca ed. Harles, vol. vii. p. 275 ss.

Since the Syrian Gnosis, which had spread even to Persia,[2] presented so many points of union with the doctrine of Zoroaster,[3] it is not surprising that the Persian Gnostics should have been led to connect their Christianity still more closely with the Zend doctrine.[4] After the spiritual aspect of the religion of Zoroaster had declined under the *Arsacidae*, and become a rude dualism and mere ceremonial worship, the *Sassanides* (from 227) did every thing in their power to restore its ancient splendour. In the assemblies of the Magi a supreme principle was acknowledged, (Zeruane akerene); and, on the other hand, unqualified dualism with its adherents (*Magusaeans*, al thanaviah) condemned. These commotions in the bosom of Parsism probably gave rise to the attempt of *Manes* to unite Christianity with the system of these magusaeans.[5] Eastern and western writers differ from one another, not only in the name of this sect-founder (*Mani—Cubricus, Manes, Manichaeus*), but also in their accounts of him.[6] They agree only in this, that he was hated by the magi, persecuted by the Persian kings, compelled to flee, and lastly, at the command of a king (according to the orientals, *Baharam* or *Bararanes* I. from 272—275) barbarously put to death as a corrupter of religion in a fort or castle, (according to the oriental writers *Dascarrah*, according to the occidental *Arabion*).

His system of religion rests on the assumption of two everlasting kingdoms coexisting and bordering on each other, *the kingdom of light* and *the kingdom of darkness*, the former under the dominion of God, the latter under the *demon* or *hyle*.

[2] Comp. § 39, note 5, § 46. Sim. de Vries de orig. et progressu relig. Christ. in vet. Persarum regno, in Barkey Museum Haganum T. iii. p. 288 ss.

[3] Die Theologie Zoroaster's nach dem Zend-Avesta v. A. Hölty, in Illgen's Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol. viii. i. 1.

[4] In opposition to Baur, who in the work already quoted, p. 433, assumes Buddhism as the third element, and with whom even Neander, l. c. second edition, p. 827, agrees, see the apposite objections of Scheckenburger in the theolog. Studien u. Kritiken 1833, iii. 890.

[5] Thom. Hyde historia religionis vett. Persarum et Parthorum et Medorum. Oxon. 1700 (new ed. Lond. 1760), 4. p. 280 ff. Abbé Foucher on the system of Manes, in J. F. Kleuker's appendix to the Zend-Avesta, Bd. i. Th. 2. S. 186 ff. Silv. de Sacy Mémoires sur diverses antiquités de la Perse. Paris 1793. 4. p. 52.

[6] The orientals are given in Herbelot bibliothèque orientale. Paris 1697. fol. (new edition, Haag. 1777, 78. 3. T. in 4.) Art. Mani. The western have all borrowed from Archelai Act. disput. cum Manete.

After the borders had been broken through by a war between the two kingdoms, and the material of light had been mixed with the material of darkness, God caused the world to be formed by *the living spirit* (ζῶν πνεῦμα, spiritus vivens) out of this mixed material, in order that by degrees the material of light here captured (anima and Jesus patibilis) might be again separated, and the old boundaries restored. Two exalted natures of light, *Christ* (whom Mani calls in preference dextra luminis, τοῦ ἀϊδίου φωτὸς υἱός, &c.) and *the Holy Spirit*, the former dwelling in the sun and moon (naves), the latter in the air, conduct this process of bringing back the material of light; while the demon and the evil spirits, fettered to the stars, endeavour to hinder them. In every man there dwells an evil soul besides the soul of light;[7] and it is his commission to secure to the latter the sway over the former, to unite with it as many as possible of the elements of light, which are scattered in nature, especially in certain plants, and thus to free it from the fetters of the evil principle, and prepare the way for its return to the kingdom of light.[8] After men had long been led astray by the demon, by means of false religions (Judaism and Heathenism), *Christ* descended from the sun to earth in the appearance of a body, to lead them to the worship of the true God, and by his doctrine to help the souls of light in their struggles for liberty. But his instructions were

[7] An old Persian notion: so says the Persian Araspas in Xenoph. Cyrop. vi. c. 1, § 21: δύο γὰρ σαφῶς ἔχω ψυχάς.—οὐ γὰρ δὴ μία γε οὖσα ἅμα ἀγαθή τέ ἐστι καὶ κακή, οὐδ' ἅμα καλῶν τε καὶ αἰσχρῶν ἔργων ἐρᾷ, καὶ ταὐτὰ ἅμα βούλεταί τε καὶ οὐ βούλεται πράττειν· ἀλλὰ δηλονότι δύο ἐστὸν ψυχά, καὶ ὅταν μὲν ἡ ἀγαθὴ κρατῇ, τὰ καλὰ πράττεται· ὅταν δὲ ἡ πονηρά, τὰ αἰσχρὰ ἐπιχειρεῖται. On the later Persians, see Kleuker's Appendix to the Zend-Avesta, Bd. 1, Th. 1, S. 261.

[8] Manes in epist. ad filiam Menoch (in Augustini op. imperf. lib. iii. c. 172): Sicut animae gignuntur animabus, itaque figmentum corporis a corporis natura digeritur. Quod ergo nascitur de carne, caro est, et quod de spiritu, spiritus est: spiritum autem animam intellige.—(c. 177) Sive enim bonum geramus, non est carnis,—sive malum geramus, non est animae. Hence the Manichaeans had peculiar notions of freedom and sin. Fortunatus disp. ii. cum Augustino c. 21: Id est peccatum animae, si post commonitionem Salvatoris nostri et sanam doctrinam ejus a contraria natura et inimica sui stirpe se non segregaverit anima. Secundinus epist. ad Augustin, § 2: (Anima) carnis commixtione ducitur, non propria voluntate. At si, cum se ipsum cognoverit, consentiat malo, et non se armet contra inimicum, voluntate sua peccavit. Quam se iterum pudeat errasse, paratum inveniet misericordiarum auctorem. Non enim punitur, quia peccavit, sed quia de peccato non doluit.

not fully understood even by the apostles, and after his death were still more falsified by the Christians.[9] Hence he promised a still greater apostle, the Παράκλητος, who should separate all that was false, and announce the truth in perfection and purity.[10] This person appeared in *Mani*. The Manichaeans accordingly rejected entirely the Old Testament.[11] All that they thought they could make use of in favour of their doctrine belonging to the canonical and apocryphal writings of the New Testament, was regarded by them as a remnant of the original truth. Whatever was opposed to their views was supposed to be error which had been subsequently mixed up with the truth.[12] Thus, they appealed, where it served their purpose, to the canonical gospels[13] and the epistles of St Paul as well as to apocryphal gos-

[9] Contemptuously called Γαλιλαῖοι by Manes in epist. ad Oddam (in Fabricii bibl. Graeca vol. v. p. 285).

[10] Mani begins his Epistola fundamenti (ap. Augustinum contra epist. Manichaei c. 5) thus: Manichaeus Apostolus Jesu Christi providentia Dei patris. Haec sunt salubria verba de perenni et vivo fonte, quae qui audierit et eisdem primum crediderit, deinde quae insinuant custodierit, numquam erit morti obnoxius, verum aeterna et gloriosa vita fruetur caet.—The Manichaean Felix (Augustin. de act. cum Felice i. 9): Paulus in altera epistola dicit: "Ex parte scimus et ex parte prophetamus: cum venerit autem quod perfectum est, abolebuntur ea, quae ex parte dicta sunt." (1 Cor. xiii. 9, 10.) Nos audientes Paulum hoc dicere, venit Manichaeus cum praedicatione sua et suscepimus eum secundum quod Christus dixit: "Mitto vobis spiritum sanctum."—Et quia venit Manichaeus, et per suam praedicationem docuit nos initium, medium et finem: docuit nos de fabrica mundi, quare facta est, et unde facta est, et qui fecerunt: docuit nos, quare dies et quare nox: docuit nos de cursu solis et lunae: quia hoc in Paulo non audivimus, nec in caeterorum Apostolorum scripturis: hoc credimus, quia ipse est Paracletus. Itaque illud iterum dico, quod superius dixi: si audiero in altera scriptura, ubi Paracletus loquitur, de quo voluero interrogare, et docueris me, credo et renuntio.—Without doubt, Manes made a distinction between the Holy Spirit and the Paraclete, but was misunderstood by the Catholics (for example Euseb. h. e. 7, 31, τοτὲ μὲν τὸν Παράκλητον καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον αὐτὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀνακηρύττων).

[11] Baur's manich. Religionsystem. S. 358. F. Trechsel über den Kanon, die Kritik u. Exegese d. Manichäer. Bern 1832. 8. S. 11.

[12] Baur S. 378. Trechsel S. 27. Faustus Manich. (ap. Augustin c. Faust. xxxii. 6): Nobis Paracletus, ex novo Testamento promissus, perinde docet, quid accipere ex eodem debeamus, et quid repudiare.

[13] Faustus (ap. Augustin. c. Faust. xxxiii. 3): Nec ab ipso (Christo) haec (Evangelia) sunt, nec ab ejus Apostolis scripta: sed multo post eorum assumptionem a nescio quibus, et ipsis inter se non concordantibus Semijudaeis per famas opinionesque comperta sunt: qui tamen omnia eadem in Apostolorum Domini conferentes nomina, vel eorum, qui secuti

pels, without entirely adopting these writings,[14] but at the same time, without attempting to purge them from error, as Marcion did. Since they found least truth in the history of the apostles written by Luke, they confronted the canonical production with another, under the name of Lucius or Leucius.[15] All these writings could not be *canonical* in their estimation, meaning by that term, absolutely authoritative. The works of Mani alone were canonical.[16]

Their morality had for its object to procure for the good the dominion over the bad soul, by a rigid self-denial. It was divided into the signaculum oris, sign. manus, and sign. sinus. It imposed on the baptised members (electi, perfecti, τέλειοι) so great privations, that most adherents of the sect remained cate-

Apostolos viderentur errores ac mendacia sua secundum eos se scripsisse mentiti sunt.

[14] Cyrillus Hieros. Catech. iv. and vi. pronounces the gospel of Thomas to be a Manichaean production, and many have followed him; but the Manichaeans may have quoted it for particular sentiments, without entirely adopting it (see Thilo cod. apocr. N. T. Proleg. p. lxxx.). The gospel of Philip was of Gnostic origin, which document is said to have been used also by the Manichaeans, Trechsel S. 59.—A catalogue of such writings, which in part at least may have been first used by the later Manichaeans, may be found in Timotheus (presb. Constantinop. about 511) l. de iis qui ad ecclesiam accedunt in J. Meursii varia divina. Lugd. Bat. 1619. 4. p. 117.

[15] Leucii Acta Apostolorum (Augustin. de actis c. Felice ii. 6), Αἱ τῶν Ἀποστόλων περίοδοι (Photius bibl. cod. 114), written by Leucius Charinus, containing the Πράξεις Πέτρου, Ἰωάννου, Ἀνδρέου, Θωμᾶ, Παύλου. Several of them exist in MS. There have been published Acta S. Thomae Apostoli ed. J. C. Thilo. Lips. 1823. 8. Comp. the Prolegomena to this work, p. lx. Respecting the person of Leucius, the most contradictory accounts are given (Trechsel S. 61). It is highly probable that he is a mythic collective for all heretical histories of the apostles, and that the name was modelled after that of Luke.

[16] Βίβλος τῶν μυστηρίων (Syriac in 22 divisions. Fragments apud Titus Bostrensis and Epiphan. haer. lxvi. 14), Β. τῶν κεφαλαίων, τὸ ζῶν εὐαγγέλιον (Oriental. Erteng?), ὁ Θησαυρὸς τῆς ζωῆς (Fragments in Augustin. de natura boni 44, de Act. cum Felice i. 14 and in Evodius de fide). These four works Manes is said to have appropriated from the remains of Scythianus. Besides these there are several letters of his: Epist. fundamenti (Augustini lib. contra epist. Manichaei, quam vocant fundamenti), Ep. ad filiam Menoch (Fragments in August. opus imperfect. lib. iii.). Fragments of the letters ad Zebenam, ad Scythianum, ad Odan, ad Cudarum in Fabricii bibl. Graeca. vol. v. p. 284 ff. ed. nov. vol. viii. p. 315, also scattered here and there in Ang. Maji scriptt. vett. nova coll. vii. i. 17, 69, 70, 277, 304.

chumens (auditores) as long as possible, for the sake of being released from the observance of the most stringent laws. The worship of the Manichaeans was very simple. They celebrated Sunday by fasting; the day of Mani's death by a yearly festival (βῆμα). Baptism, which was administered with oil,[17] and the Lord's supper belonged to the secret worship of the electi.

Mani himself sent out twelve apostles to propagate his doctrine, in like manner afterwards electi were constantly despatched for this purpose. Hence the party remained in very close union. At the head of them was one person, to whom 12 magistri immediately, and again the 72 bishops of the churches, were subordinate. Many followers were attracted by the historical form in which Mani endeavoured to explain so much that is incomprehensible,[18] and by the asceticism of his adherents. Accordingly the Manichaeans spread, soon after the death of their founder, into proconsular Asia, and even further in the Roman dominions, although they were opposed with vehemence, not only by the catholic church, but also persecuted by heathen emperors,[19] who

[17] Theol. Studien u. Kritiken i. iii. 620. Baur S. 277.

[18] Augustinus de utilitate credendi c. 1 (Opp. ed. Bened. viii. 34): Nosti enim, Honorate, non aliam ob causam nos in tales homines incidisse, nisi quod se dicebant, terribili auctoritate separata, mira et simplici ratione eos, qui se audire vellent, introducturos ad Deum, et errore omni liberaturos, &c.

[19] Diocletian's edict to Julian, proconsul of Africa, against the Manichaeans dat. prid. Kal. April. (287?) Alexandriae, mentioned also by Ambrosiaster ad. 2 Tim. iii. 7, and preserved in the Lex Dei s. Mosaicarum et Romanarum legum collatio (best edition by F. Blume. Bonnae 1833. 8) tit. xv. c. 3, and in the Codicis Gregoriani fragmentis (ed. G. Haenel. Bonnae 1837. 4. p. 44):—De quibus Solertia tua Serenitati nostrae retulit Manichaeis, audivimus eos nuperrime, veluti nova inopinata prodigia, in hunc mundum de persica, adversaria nobis gente, progressa vel orta esse, et multa facinora ibi committere: populos namque quietos turbare, nec non et civitatibus maxima detrimenta inserere: et verendum est, ne forte, ut fieri adsolet, accedenti tempore conentur (per) exsecrandas consuetudines et scaevas leges Persarum innocentioris naturae homines, romanam gentem modestam atque tranquillam, et universum orbem nostrum veluti venenis suis malevolis inficere.—Jubemus namque, auctores quidem ac principes una cum abominandis scripturis eorum severiori poenae subjici, ita ut flammeis ignibus exurantur; consentaneos vero et usque adeo contentiosos capite puniri praecipimus, et eorum bona fisco nostro vindicari sancimus. Si qui sane etiam honorati, aut cujuslibet dignitatis, vel majoris, personae ad hanc inauditam et turpem atque per omnia infamem sectam, vel ad doctrinam Persarum se transtulerunt, eorum patrimonia fisco nostro adsociari facies: ipsos quo-

enacted bloody laws against them as a sect derived from the hostile Persians.

THIRD CHAPTER.

THEOLOGY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

I. IN THE EAST.

§ 62.

ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOL.

J. G. Michaelis de scholae Alexandrinae sic dictae catecheticae origine, progressu ac praecipuis doctoribus (Symbolae literariae i. iii. 195. Bremae 1745). J. F. Hilscher de schola Alexandrina. Lips. 1776. 4. H. E. F. Guerike de schola, quae Alexandriae floruit, comm hist. et theol. (Pp. ii. Halis Sax. 1824. 25. 8.) Pars prior: de externa Scholae Historia, C. F. G. Hasselbach de Schola, quae Alexandriae floruit, catechetica Part. i. A Stettin school-programm of the year 1826. Neander's Kirchengesch. i. ii. 909 ff. Redepenning's Origenes i. 57.

In the present period, Christian theology was cultivated especially at *Alexandria*, at that time the seat of all the sciences, where the catholic teachers, even by their external relations to the heathen and Gnostics, were compelled to enter philosophically into the doctrines of Christianity.[1] Here began to be very soon felt the necessity of an instruction beyond the usual one given to catechumens, as well for the philosophical proselytes as for those who were to become teachers. After many persons thirsting for knowledge had been in this way collected about a distinguished man, the institution of the *Alexandrian catechetical school*[2] attached itself to these prior individual efforts shortly be-

que foenensibus vel proconensibus metallis dari. Ut igitur stirpitus amputari mala haec nequitia de saeculo beatissimo nostro possit, Devotio tua jussis ac statutis Tranquillitatis Nostrae maturius obsecundare (festinet). Explanations of this passage may be found in Bynkershoek de relig. peregrina diss. ii. (Opusc. ii. 207.) Cannegieter ad fragm. vet. jurisprud. c. 24.

[1] Origenes ap. Eusebium vi. 19, 5.

[2] Euseb. v. 10 (speaking of the time of Commodus): ἠγεῖτο δὲ τηνικαῦτα

fore the present period. The height of its prosperity falls under this very time, and its distinguished teachers (*κατηχήσεων* magistri Hieron. cat. c. 38.) *Pantaenus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origenes, Heraclas, Dionysius,*[3] *(Pierius* and *Theognostus?)* are the only persons by whom Christian theology was now advanced. The Alexandrian school took its peculiar direction from its very first teachers. *Pantaenus,* a Stoic philosopher, is otherwise unknown; and we can only judge of him by his pupil *Titus Flavius Clemens.* The peculiarity of the Alexandrian school is already stamped on the writings of the latter, who was president of the catechetical institution from about 191 till 202, then fled in the persecution raised by Severus, and probably returned to Alexandria († about 220).[4] But the characteristics of the school

τῆς τῶν πιστῶν αὐτόθι (κατ' Ἀλεξάνδρειαν) διατριβῆς ἀνὴρ κατὰ παιδείαν ἐνδοξότατος, ὄνομα αὐτῷ Πάνταινος· ἐξ ἀρχαίου ἔθους διδασκαλείου τῶν ἱερῶν λόγων παρ' αὐτοῖς συνεστῶτος, ὃ καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς παρατείνεται, καὶ πρὸς τῶν ἐν λόγῳ καὶ τῇ περὶ τὰ θεῖα σπουδῇ δυνατῶν συγχρωτεῖσθαι παρειλήφαμεν· This account is given more fully by Jerome in catal. 36: Pantaenus, stoicae sectae philosophus, juxta quandam veterem in Alexandria consuetudinem, ubi a Marco Evangelista semper ecclesiastici fuere doctores, tantae prudentiae et eruditionis tam in Scripturis divinis, quam in saeculari literatura fuit, ut in Indiam quoque—mitteretur. Names: *τὸ τῆς κατηχήσεως διδασκαλεῖον* (Euseb. h. e. vi. 3, 1, vi. 26,) *τὸ ἱερὸν διδασκαλεῖον τῶν ἱερῶν μαθημάτων* (Sozom. h. e. iii. 15), ecclesiastica schola (Hieron. cat. c. 38), schola *κατηχήσεων* (ibid. c. 69).

[3] This is the order according to Eusebius and others. On the other hand, Philippi Sidetae (about 490) fragm. in Henr. Dodwelli dissertatt. in Irenaeum. Oxon. 1689. 8. p. 490 ss.: Athenagoras, Pantaenus, Origenes, Heraclas, Dionysius, Clemens, Pierius, Theognostus, Serapion, Petrus Martyr, Macarius *πολιτικός,* Didymus, Rhodon. Even Socrates hist. eccl. vi. c. 27, finds fault with the Christian history of Philip *ὅτι τοὺς χρόνους τῆς ἱστορίας συγχέει.*

[4] Writings: *λόγος προτρεπτικὸς πρὸς Ἕλληνας*—*παιδαγωγός* 3 Books—*στρώματα* or *στρωματεῖς* libb. viii. (cf. Photii. cod. ex. *λόγος, τίς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος* (c. comment. C. Segaar. Traj. ad Rh. 1816. 8). With others of his writings have been also unfortunately lost the *Ὑποτυπώσεις* in 8 books, in which later orthodoxy found many *ἀσεβεῖς καὶ μυθώδεις λόγους* (See Photius cod. 109). The fragments of it have been collected by Potter in his edition of Clement, vol. ii. p. 1006 ss. A small portion of it, Remarks on the Catholic epistles, has been preserved in a Latin translation under the title of Adumbrationes Clem. Alex. (best ed. Potter l. c.); probably the same of which Cassiodorus de institut. div. lit. c. 8, says, that he had prepared it ut exclusis quibusdam offendiculis purificata doctrina ejus securior possit hauriri. Comp. Lücke's Comm. über die Schriften Johannis. 2te Auflage iii. 77. Perhaps also the *Ἐκ τῶν προφητικῶν* (prophetic interpretations) *ἐκλογαί* apud Potter p. 989 are

were completely developed and matured by the great *Origen* (ὁ χαλκέντερος, ὁ ἀδαμάντιος) the son of the martyr *Leonides*, who died in 202. When a youth of eighteen he was a catechist at Alexandria,[5] and procured for himself a great reputation even in other places. But he displeased his bishop, *Demetrius*, by being consecrated presbyter at *Caesarea* (228), went thither in 231, and was then excluded from communion with the church on account of his peculiar opinions. The churches in Palestine, Arabia, and Achaia, paid no regard, however, to this excommunication; and Origen not only continued to fill the office of presbyter in Caesarea, but likewise gave instruction in the sciences. Besides, the revision of the corrupted Septuagint (τὰ ἑξαπλᾶ) occupied him for twenty-eight years. During this time he was twice invited to synods which were held in Arabia against heretics; and both times he succeeded in convincing them of their errors (*Beryllus* of *Bostra* 244—Arabici 248). So distinguished a teacher of Christianity could not be overlooked in persecutions. He escaped from *Maximin the Thracian* by fleeing to his friend *Firmilian*, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia. But in the *Decian* persecution he suffered so much ill usage in Tyre, that he died there some years after († 254).[6]

remains of the Hypotyposes.—Opp. omnia ed. J. Potter. Oxon. 1715. 2 voll. fol. R. Klotz. Lips. 1831—34. 4 voll. 8.—P. Hofstede de Groot disp. de Clemente Alex. Groningae 1826. 8. v. Cölln's article on Clemens in Ersch and Gruber's Encyclop. Th. 18. S. 4 ff. A. F. Daehne de γνώσει Clementis Alex. Lips. 1831. 8. Bedeutung des Alex. Clemens f. d. Entstehung d. christl. Theologie, by D. Kling in the theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1841. iv. 857. Ritter's Gesch. d. christl. Philos. i. 421. Redepenning's Origenes i. 70. [See the article on Clement in Smith's Dictionary of Biography and Mythology].

[5] His self-mutilation, related by Eusebius vi. 2, is questioned by Schnitzer (Origenes über die Grundlehren, Einleit. S. xxxiii). On the other side see Engelhardt in the Theol. Stud. u. Kritik. for 1838, i. 157, and Redepenning's Origines i. 202.—According to Porphry Origen was also a hearer of Ammonius Saccas (Euseb. vi. 19), which appears to be confirmed by himself in a fragment there given. In opposition to Ritter (Gesch. d. Philos. iv. 576. Gesch. d. christl. Phil. i. 467,) who denies it, see Redepenning i. 230, and L. Krüger über das Verhältniss d. Orig. zu Amm. Sakkas, in Illgen's Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol. 1843, i. 46.—That in addition to the famous Origen, there was a contemporary heathen philosopher of the same name is proved, in opposition to many writers, by Redepenning i. 421, and Krüger S. 51.

[6] On Origen's life, theology, and writings, see Pet. Dan. Huetii Origeniana libb. iii., prefixed to his edition of the commentaries, and in de la

§ 63.

(CONTINUATION).—REPRESENTATION OF THE ALEXANDRIAN THEOLOGY, PARTICULARLY THAT OF ORIGEN.

Guerike de schola Alex. catech. (s. notice prefixed to § 62). Pars posterior: De scholae Alex. catecheticae theologia. Halis 1825, and the works relating to the doctrine of Clement and Origen which have been already quoted, §. 62. note 5 and 6. [Davidson's Sacred Hermeneutics. Edinburgh, 1843.]

The Alexandrians set a very high value on philosophy, both because it was formerly among the heathen what the law was

Rue vol. iv. App. p. 79 ss. Ceillier histoire des auteurs sacrés et ecclés. T. ii. p. 584 ss. Origenes, eine Darstellung s. Lebens u. s. Lehre v. C. R. Redepenning. Abth. 1. Bonn 1841. A development of his doctrine alone in: Origenes, ein Beitrag zur Dogmengesch. d. dritten Jahrh. v. G. Thomasius. Nürnberg 1837. Writings: 1, exegetical, the model and source for all succeeding Greek commentators: σημειώσεις, scholia—τόμοι, commentarii—ὁμιλίαι. (On these three kinds of explanatory writings, see Rufinus invectiv. in Hieron. lib. ii. in Hieron. opp. ed. Martianay T. iv. p. ii. p. 426. On the homilies, Tzschirneri opusc. acad. p. 206 ss.) Orig. in sacr. script. commentaria, quaecunque graece reperiri potuerunt, ed. P. D. Huetius 2 voll. Rothomagi 1668, also Paris 1679, and Coloniae (Frankfurt) 1685. fol. Most of the expository writings are extant only in the Latin translations of Rufinus and Jerome. 2, κατὰ Κέλσου τόμοι ἡ (ed. G. Spencer, Cantabrig. 1658. 4). 3, περὶ ἀρχῶν lib. iv. only fragments of the Greek are extant, but Rufinus's Latin version is entire (Orig. de principiis, ed. et annotatione instruxit E. R. Redepenning. Lips. 1836. 8). Origenes über die Grundlehren der Glaubenswissenschaft. Wiederherstellungsversuch von Dr K. F. Schnitzer. Stuttgart 1835. 8. Cf. Rufini praef.: Interpretando sequor regulam praedecessorum, et ejus praecipui viri, cujus superius fecimus mentionem (Hieronymi), qui cum ultra lxx. libellos Origenis—transtulisset in Latinum, in quibus cum aliquanta offendicula inveniantur in Graeco, ita elimavit omnia interpretando, atque purgavit, ut nihil in illis, quod a fide nostra discrepet, latinus lector inveniat. Hieron. adv. Rufin. lib. i. ed. Martian. T. iv. p. ii. p. 355. Concerning this translation of Rufinus: quum —contulissem cum Graeco, illico animadverti, quae Origenes de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto impie dixerat, et quae romanae aures ferre non poterant, in meliorem partem ab interprete commutata. Cactera autem dogmata, de angelorum ruina, de animarum lapsu, de resurrectionis praestigiis, de mundo vel intermundiis Epicuri, de restitutione omnium in aequalem statum, et multo his deteriora, quae longum esset retexere, vel ita vertisse, ut in Graeco invenerat, vel de commentariolis Didymi, qui Origenis apertissimus propugnator est, exaggerata et firmiora posuisse. Ejusd. Epist. 94, ad Avitum; quae insania est, paucis de Filio et Spiritu

among the Jews, a preparation for Christianity, and because by it alone a deeper knowledge of Christian doctrine is opened up, (*γνῶσις*, hence *γνωστικοί*, in Origen *σοφία*, *ἡ θεία σοφία*).[1] This *γνῶσις* was certainly different from the *ψευδώνυμος γνῶσις* of the errorists; since the received doctrines of the church (*πίστις*)[2] were

Sancto commutatis, quae apertam blasphemiam praeferebant, caetera ita ut scripta sunt protulisse in medium?' Respecting his own and other earlier versions, Ejusdem Epist. 41, ad Pammach. et Oceanum: Ego omnia, quae vitiata fuerunt, correxi. Nec disertiores sumus Hilario, nec fideliores Victorina, qui ejus tractatus, non ut interpretes, sed ut auctores proprii operis transtulerunt. Nuper S. Ambrosius sic Hexaëmeron illius compilavit, ut magis Hippolyti sententias Basiliique sequeretur. On the translation of Rufinus, see Redepenning prolegomena p. xlv. To the lost writings also belong the *στρωματεῖς* in ten books. Philocalia a Basilio M. et Gregorio Theol. ex variis Origenis commentariis excerpta, primum graece ed. Jo. Tarinus. Paris 1618. 4. Orig. opp. omnia ed. Car. et Car. Vinc de la Rue. Par. 1740—59. 4 voll. fol. denuo recensuit C. H. E. Lommatzsch till the present time, 17 Tomi. Berolini 1831—44 small 8. (containing the whole of his exegetical and smaller writings).

[1] Clemens in Strom. (ed. Potter) i. p. 331: *Ἦν μὲν οὖν πρὸ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου παρουσίας εἰς δικαιοσύνην Ἕλλησιν ἀναγκαία φιλοσοφία· νυνὶ δὲ χρησίμη πρὸς θεοσέβειαν γίνεται, προπαιδεία τις οὖσα τοῖς τὴν πίστιν δι' ἀποδείξεως καρπουμένοις—ἐπαιδαγώγει καὶ αὐτὴ (ἡ φιλοσοφία) τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν, ὡς ὁ νόμος τοὺς Ἑβραίους εἰς Χριστόν.* p. 337: *Θεόθεν ἦκεν εἰς ἀνθρώπους.* (Cf. vii. p. 832: *ὁ Κύριος ἐστὶν ὁ διδοὺς καὶ τοῖς Ἕλλησι τὴν φιλοσοφίαν διὰ τῶν ὑποδεεστέρων ἀγγέλων.*) P. 338: *φιλοσοφίαν δὲ οὐ τὴν Στωϊκὴν λέγω, οὐδὲ τὴν Πλατωνικὴν, ἢ τὴν Ἐπικούρειόν τε, καὶ Ἀριστοτελικήν· ἀλλ' ὅσα εἴρηται παρ' ἑκάστῃ τῶν αἱρέσεων τούτων καλῶς, δικαιοσύνην μετὰ εὐσεβοῦς ἐπιστήμης ἐκδιδάσκοντα, τοῦτο σύμπαν τὸ ἐκλεκτικὸν φιλοσοφίαν φημί.* Hence his zeal against those who asserted (Strom. i. p. 326), *πρὸς κακοῦ ἂν τὴν φιλοσοφίαν εἰσδεδυκέναι τὸν βίον ἐπὶ λύμῃ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, πρός τινος εὑρετοῦ πονηροῦ,* namely (vi. p. 773 and 822) *τοῦ διαβόλου.* Origenes in Genesin hom. 14, § 3. Philosophia neque in omnibus legi Dei contraria est, neque in omnibus consona. Moralis et physica, quae dicitur philosophia, paene omnia, quae nostra sunt, sentiunt.

[2] Clem. Strom. vii. p. 864: *Ἔστιν γάρ, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, ἡ γνῶσις τελείωσίς τις ἀνθρώπου, ὡς ἀνθρώπου, διὰ τῆς τῶν θείων ἐπιστήμης συμπληρουμένη, κατά τε τὸν τρόπον καὶ τὸν βίον καὶ τὸν λόγον σύμφωνος καὶ ὁμόλογος ἑαυτῇ τε καὶ τῷ θείῳ λόγῳ. Διὰ ταύτης γὰρ τελειοῦται ἡ πίστις, ὡς τελείου τοῦ πιστοῦ ταύτῃ μόνως γιγνομένου.* P. 865: *ἡ μὲν οὖν πίστις σύντομος ἐστιν, ὡς εἰπεῖν, τῶν κατεπειγόντων γνῶσις· ἡ γνῶσις δὲ ἀπόδειξις τῶν διὰ πίστεως παρειλημμένων ἰσχυρὰ καὶ βέβαιος, διὰ τῆς κυριακῆς διδασκαλίας ἐποικοδομουμένη τῇ πίστει.* ii. p. 445: *Στοιχείων γοῦν τῆς γνώσεως τῶν προειρημένων ἀρετῶν* (hope, repentance, abstinence, patience, love), *στοιχειωδεστέρανεῖναι συμβέβηκε τὴν πίστιν, οὕτως ἀναγκαίαν τῷ γνωστικῷ ὑπάρχουσαν, ὡς τῷ κατὰ τὸν κόσμον τόνδε βιοῦντι πρὸς τὸ ζῆν τὸ ἀναπνεῖν· Ὡς δ' ἄνευ τῶν τεσσάρων στοιχείων οὐκ ἔστι ζῆν, οὐδ' ἄνευ πίστεως γνῶσιν ἐπακολουθῆσαι· αὕτη τοίνυν κρηπὶς ἀληθείας.* Origenes c. Celsum lib. vi. (ed. Spencer, p. 284): *ἡ θεία τοίνυν σοφία, ἑτέρα οὖσα τῆς*

adopted as an immutable basis for the orthodox Gnosis, having been moulded and modified in express opposition to the Gnostics. Yet these orthodox Gnostics were led by the connection of certain general philosophical principles and opinions with Christianity, to many speculations which were very like those of their heretical brethren. Like them too, they believed that their Gnosis[3] had been handed down as a mysterious doctrine;[4] and that it should be communicated only to the initiated.[5] Hence Origen writes about such doctrines with visible hesitation, and warns in particular, against bringing them before the people.[6] Towards the uninitiated, the Alexandrians regarded

πίστεως, πρῶτόν ἐστι τῶν καλουμένων χαρισμάτων τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ μετ' ἐκείνην δεύτερον, τοῖς ἀκριβοῦν τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐπισταμένοις, ἡ καλουμένη γνῶσις· καὶ τρίτον (ἐπεὶ σώζεσθαι χρὴ καὶ τοὺς ἁπλουστέρους, προσιόντας κατὰ δύναμιν τῇ Θεοσεβείᾳ) ἡ πίστις, with reference to 1 Cor. xii. 8, 9. De principiis i. praef. § 3: Illud autem scire oportet, quoniam sancti Apostoli fidem Christi praedicantes de quibusdam quidem, quaecunque necessaria crediderunt, omnibus—manifestissime tradiderunt, rationem scilicet assertionis eorum relinquentes ab his inquirendam, qui Spiritus dona excellentia mererentur: de aliis vero dixerunt quidem, quia sint; quomodo autem, aut unde sint, siluerunt, profecto ut studiosiores quique ex posteris suis, qui amatores essent sapientiae, exercitium habere possent, in quo ingenii sui fructum ostenderent, hi videlicet qui dignos se et capaces ad recipiendam sapientiam praepararent. Neander's KG. i. ii. 912 ff. A. F. Daehne de γνώσει Clem. Al. Lips. 1831. 8. Redepenning's Origenes i. 335.

[3] And still earlier, Philo. see Grossmann de Judaeorum disciplina arcani p. i. (a Leipzig programm at the Reformation anniversary, 1833. 4.)

[4] Clemens Strom. vi. p. 771: γνωστικὴ παράδοσις.—ἡ γνῶσις δὲ αὐτὴ, ἡ κατὰ διαδοχὰς εἰς ὀλίγους ἐκ τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἀγράφως παραδοθεῖσα κατελήλυθεν. Idem hypotyp. vii. (ap. Euseb. h. e. ii. 1, 2): Ἰακώβῳ τῷ δικαίῳ καὶ Ἰωάννῃ καὶ Πέτρῳ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν παρέδωκε τὴν γνῶσιν ὁ κύριος· οὗτοι τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀποστόλοις παρέδωκαν, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι τοῖς ἑβδομήκοντα. Origenes c. Cels. vi. p. 279: Ἰησοῦς, ὅτι μὲν ἐλάλει τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς κατ' ἰδίαν, καὶ μάλιστα ἐν ταῖς ἀναχωρήσεσιν, εἴρηται· τίνα δ' ἦν, ἃ ἔλεγεν, οὐκ ἀναγέγραπται· οὐ γὰρ ἐφαίνετο αὐτοῖς γραπτέα ἱκανῶς εἶναι ταῦτα πρὸς τοὺς πολλούς, οὐδέ ῥητά.

[5] Clem. Strom. i. p. 324: τὰ μὲν ἐκὼν παραπέμπομαι, ἐκλέγων ἐπιστημόνως, φοβούμενος γράφειν, ἃ καὶ λέγειν ἐφυλαξάμην. οὔ τί που φθονῶν, οὐ γὰρ θέμις, δεδιὼς δὲ ἄρα περὶ τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων, μή πῃ ἑτέρως σφαλεῖεν, καὶ παιδὶ μάχαιραν, ἣ φασιν οἱ παροιμιαζόμενοι, δρέγοντες εὑρεθῶμεν. Origen. c. Cels. i. p. 7: In Christianity let there be τινὰ οἷον μετὰ τὰ ἐξωτερικὰ, μὴ εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς φθάνοντα.

[6] Thus the doctrine of the termination of future punishment. Respecting his views de fine vel consummatione, he says de princ. i. 6, § 1. Quae quidem a nobis etiam cum magno metu et cautela dicuntur, discutientibus magis et pertractantibus quam pro certo ac definito statuentibus etc.

a certain accommodation as necessary, which might venture even to make use of falsehood for the attainment of a good end, yea, which was obliged to do so;[7] and hence they did not scruple to acknowledge in many ecclesiastical doctrines such an accommodation.[8]

The Alexandrian theology set out with the most elevated idea of God, and strove to keep far away from it all anthropopathic limitations. In like manner it declared the freedom of the rational being to be inalienable; and asserted for the purpose of

7 Plato de republ. iii. had long before allowed untruth in certain cases ἐν φαρμάκου εἴδει as useful. So also Philo, who speaks just as the Christian Alexandrians of a twofold mode of religious instruction, Quod Deus sit immutabilis p. 302: Οἱ μὲν οὖν εὐμοίρου φύσεως λαχόντες καὶ ἀγωγῆς ἀνυπαιτίου—ἀληθείᾳ συνοδοιπόρῳ χρῶνται, παρ' ἧς μυηθέντες τὰ περὶ τοῦ ὄντος ἀψευδῆ μυστήρια, τῶν γενέσεως οὐδὲν προσαναπλάττουσιν αὐτῷ (τῷ θεῷ). Τούτοις οἰκειότατον πρόκειται κεφάλαιον ἐν τοις ἱεροφαντηθεῖσι χρησμοῖς, ὅτι οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ὁ θεὸς, ἀλλ' οἷός ὡς οὐρανός, οἷός ὡς κόσμος.—Οἱ δέ γε νωθεστέρᾳ μὲν καὶ ἀμβλείᾳ κεχρημένοι τῇ φύσει, περὶ δὲ τὰς ἐν παισὶ τροφὰς πλημμεληθέντες, ὀξὺ καθορᾷν ἀδυνατοῦντες ἰατρῶν δέονται νομοθετῶν, οἳ πρὸς τὸ παρὸν πάθος τὴν οἰκείαν ἐπινοήσουσι θεραπείαν—Μανθανέτωσαν οὖν πάντες οἱ τοιοῦτοι τὰ ψευδῆ, δι' ὧν ὠφεληθήσονται, εἰ μὴ δύνανται δι' ἀληθείας σωφρονίζεσθαι. Clemens Al. strom. vi. p. 802: Ψεῦσται τῷ ὄντι οὐχ οἱ συμπεριφερόμενοι δι' οἰκονομίαν σωτηρίας—ἀλλ' οἱ εἰς τὰ κυριώτατα παραπίπτοντες καὶ ἀθετοῦντες μὲν τὸν Κύριον τὸ ὅσον ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, ἀποστεροῦντες δὲ τοῦ Κυρίου τὴν ἀληθῆ διδασκαλίαν. Origenes strom. vi. (in Hieronymi apol. i. adv. Rufin. c. 18) brings forward that passage of Plato in defence of this kind of accommodation, and adds: Homo autem, cui incumbit necessitas mentiendi, diligenter attendat, ut sic utatur interdum mendacio, quomodo condimento atque medicamine, ut servet mensuram ejus. Ex quo perspicuum est, quod nisi ita mentiti fuerimus, ut magnum nobis ex hoc aliquod quaeratur bonum, judicandi simus quasi inimici ejus, qui ait: "Ego sum veritas." Cf. Historia antiquior sententiarum Eccl. graecae de accommodatione Christo inprimis et Apostolis tributa, diss. scripsit F. A. Carus. Lips. 1793. 4.

8 Origenes c. Cels. iii. p. 159, in allusion to the Christian eschatology attacked by Celsus: Ἐὰν δέ τις ἐν τούτοις δεισιδαιμονίαν μᾶλλον ἢ πονηρίαν περὶ τοὺς πολλοὺς τῶν πιστευόντων τῷ λόγῳ εἶναι φαντάζηται, καὶ ἐγκαλῇ ὡς δεισιδαίμονας ποιοῦντι τῷ λόγῳ ἡμῶν· φήσομεν πρὸς αὐτὸν, ὅτι ὥσπερ ἔλεγέ τις τῶν νομοθετῶν (Solon) πρὸς ἐρωτῶντα, εἰ τοὺς καλλίστους ἔθετο τοῖς πολίταις νόμους, ὅτι οὐ τοὺς καθάπαξ καλλίστους, ἀλλ' ὧν ἐδύναντο τοὺς καλλίστους. Οὕτω λέγοιτο ἂν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ Χριστιανῶν λόγου, ὅτι, ὧν ἐδύναντο οἱ πολλοὶ εἰς βελτίωσιν ἤδη, τοὺς καλλίστους ἐθέμην νόμους καὶ διδασκαλίαν, πόνους οὐ ψευδεῖς ἀπειλῶν καὶ κολάσεις τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσιν, ἀλλ' ἀληθεῖς μὲν καὶ ἀναγκαίους, εἰς ἐπανόρθωσιν τῶν ἀντιτεινόντων προσαγομένους· οὐ μὴν καὶ πάντως τὸ τοῦ κωλάζοντος βούλημα, καὶ τὸ τῶν πόνων ἔργον· καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ πρὸς τὸ χρήσιμον, καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἀληθὲς, καὶ μετ' ἐπικρύψεως συμφερόντως λέγεται.

removing from the Deity every idea of groundless caprice, that the external circumstances of all morally free beings can only be made conditional by their moral relations. Since at the same time this theology assumed that the world was created only on account of the rational being and conformably to his moral necessities, the existence of evil in the present world was thereby explained, though the necessity of a change of world is also established, so far as the moral relations of those beings change. The most remarkable of their principles which result from these premises, and appear fully unfolded in Origen, are the following:

1. The godhead can never be idle. Before the present world there was an endless series of worlds, and an infinite succession of them will follow it.[9]

2. All intellectual beings (angels, stars, men, demons) were originally created alike, but they were never without bodies, since incorporeality is a peculiar prerogative of Deity. After a great moral inequality had arisen among them by their difference of conduct, God created the present world, which affords a dwelling place to all classes in proportion as they answer their moral condition. The fallen intellectual beings he put into bodies more or less gross according to the measure of their sinfulness.[10] Still they all retain their moral freedom, so that they may rise again from the degraded circumstances in which they exist. Even the punishments of the condemned are not eternal, but only remedial; the Devil himself being capable of amelioration and pardon.[11] When the world shall have answered its purpose, as the

[9] Still earlier Clement in the Hypotyposes ὕλην ἄχρονον,—ἔτι δὲ μετεμψυχώσεις, καὶ πολλοὺς πρὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ κόσμους τεραστεύεται (Phot. cod. 109). Origenes de princ. iii. 5, 3. In like manner Plato and the Stoics.

[10] That Clement also taught this, Strom. iv. p. 640, is asserted by Keil opp. vol. ii. p. 652, but denied by Hofstede de Groot disp. de Clem. Alex. p. 60: Both accordingly interpret the word μετεμψυχώσεις in Photius, note 9, differently. On the other hand, Origen advances this doctrine plainly, de princ. ii. 9, § 6. cf. Keil. p. 654 ss.—A similar doctrine of Basilides, see Neander's gnost. Systeme. S. 41. 50 ff.

[11] That Clement. strom. i. p. 367 s. ὁ δὲ Διάβολος αὐτεξούσιος ὤν, καὶ μετανοῆσαι οἷός τε ἦν καὶ κλέψαι, did not hold this point, is proved by Hofstede de Groot. p. 71. On the contrary, Origen de princip. i. 6, § 2: Hi vero, qui de statu primae beatitudinis moti quidem sunt, non tamen irremediabiliter moti, illis, quos supra descripsimus, sanctis beatisque ordinibus dispensandi subjecti sunt ac regendi: quorum adjutorio usi, et institutionibus ac disciplinis salutaribus reformati, redire ac restitui ad statum suae beatitudinis possint.—§ 3: Ex quo, ut opinor, hoc conse-

abode of fallen spirits, it will then be destroyed by fire; and by this very fire souls will be completely purified from all stains contracted by intimate union with the body.[12] But as spirits always retain their freedom, they may also sin again, in which case a new world like this will be again necessary.

3. The Alexandrians speak of the Logos,[13] the mediator of all Divine agency, in very exalted, but not always definite expressions. Evidently, however, they place him beneath the supreme God.[14] Their endeavour to remove all ideas unworthy of God

quentia ipsa videtur ostendere, unamquamque rationabilem naturam posse ab uno in alterum ordinem transeuntem per singulos in omnes, et ab omnibus in singulos pervenire, dum accessus profectuum defectuumve varios pro motibus vel conatibus propriis unusquisque pro liberi arbitrii facultate perpetitur.

[12] Clemens strom. vii. c. 6 in fine p. 851. (cf. Hofstede de Groot disp. de Clem. Alex. p. 108 ss.) Origenes in Exod. xv. 5 (hom. vi. in Exod. ed. de la Rue t. ii. p. 148): Idcirco igitur qui salvus fit, per ignem salvus fit, ut si quid forte de specie plumbi habuerit admixtum, id ignis decoquat, et resolvat, ut efficiantur omnes aurum bonum.—Veniendum est ergo omnibus ad ignem, veniendum est ad conflatorium. Sedet enim Dominus, et conflat, et purgat filios Juda (Mal. iii. 3). Sed et illuc cum venitur, si quis multa opera bona, et parum aliquid iniquitatis attulerit, illud parum tanquam plumbum igni resolvitur ac purgatur, et totum remanet aurum purum. Et si quis plus illuc plumbi detulerit, plus exuritur, ut amplius decoquatur ut etsi parum aliquid sit auri, purgatum tamen resideat. Quod si aliquis illuc totus plumbeus venerit, fiet de illo hoc quod scriptum est, demergetur in profundum, tanquam plumbum in aquam validissimam. Homil. xiv. in Lucam (t. iii. p. 948): Ego puto, quod et post resurrectionem ex mortuis indigeamus sacramento eluente nos atque purgante: nemo enim absque sordibus resurgere poterit. c. Celsum v. p. 240 s. against Celsus, who derided the notion of a conflagration of the world, οὐ συνιδὼν, ὅτι, ὥσπερ Ἑλλήνων τισὶν ἔδοξε (τάχα παρὰ τοῦ ἀρχαιοτάτου ἐθνους Ἑβραίων λαβοῦσι), τὸ πῦρ καθάρσιον ἐπάγεται τῷ κόσμῳ· εἰκὸς δ' ὅτι καὶ ἑκάστῳ τῶν δεομένων τῆς διὰ τοῦ πυρὸς δίκης ἅμα καὶ ἰατρείας.

[13] Comp. with reference to Clement of Alexandria Martini's Gesch. d. Dogma v. d. Gottheit Christi. S. 74 ff. Guerike de schola Alex. P. ii. p. 131 ss. Hofstede de Groot p. 47 ss. Redepenning's Origenes i. 109, with reference to Origen: Martini S. 151 ff. Guerike 197 ss. Schleiermacher in his theolog. Zeitschrift Heft 3. S. 342 ff. Rettberg doctrina Originis de λόγῳ divino, in Illgen's Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol. iii. 1, 39. Origenes v. Thomasius S. 129.—On both see Baur's Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit i. 186. Meier's Lehre v. Trinität i. 93.

[14] Clem. Strom. vii. p. 831: τελειωτάτη δὴ καὶ ἁγιωτάτη, καὶ κυριωτάτη, καὶ ἡγεμονικωτάτη, καὶ βασιλικωτάτη, καὶ εὐεργετικωτάτη ἡ υἱοῦ φύσις, ἡ τῷ μόνῳ παντοκράτορι προσεχεστάτη. Paedag. iii. p. 251: μεσίτης ὁ λόγος, ὁ κοινὸς ἀμφοῖν, θεοῦ μὲν υἱὸς, σωτὴρ δὲ ἀνθρώπων· καὶ τοῦ μὲν διάκονος, ἡμῶν δὲ παιδαγωγός. Strom. vii. p. 838: τὸ δεύτερον αἴτιον.—Origenes comm. in

from the generation of the Son, was completed by Origen in his assertions that the Logos did not proceed from the essence of the Father,[15] but as a constant ray of the Divine glory[16] was brought forth, *i. e.* created, or begotten[17] by the will of God,[18] and

Johannem tom. ii. 2: τίθησι (Ἰωάννης) τὸ ἄρρητον, ὅτε ἡ θεὸς ὀνομασία ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀγεννήτου τάσσεται τῶν ὅλων αἰτίου, σιωπᾷ δὲ αὐτό, ὅτε ὁ λόγος θεὸς ὀνομάζεται.—αὐτόθεος (ἀληθινὸς θεὸς) ὁ θεός ἐστι, διόπερ καὶ ὁ σωτὴρ φησιν ἐν τῇ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα εὐχῇ, ἵνα γινώσκωσί σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν (Jo. xvii. 3,) πᾶν δὲ τὸ παρὰ τὸ αὐτόθεος μετοχῇ τῆς ἐκείνου θεότητος θεοποιούμενον, οὐχ ὁ θεὸς ἀλλὰ θεὸς κυριώτερον ἂν λέγοιτο. ᾧ πάντως ὁ πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως ἅτε πρῶτος τῷ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εἶναι, σπάσας τῆς θεότητος εἰς ἑαυτὸν, ἐστὶ τιμιώτερος τοῖς λοιποῖς παρ' αὐτὸν θεοῖς κ. τ. λ. (how loose the Alexandrians were in the use of θεός may be seen below, note 26,) εἰ πάντα διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐγένετο, οὐχ ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου ἐγένετο, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ κρείττονος καὶ μείζονος παρὰ τὸν λόγον. c. Cels. viii. p. 387: ἔστω δὲ, τινὰς—διὰ τὴν προπέτειαν ὑποτίθεσθαι τὸν Σωτῆρα εἶναι τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεόν· ἀλλ' οὕτιγε ἡμεῖς τοιοῦτον, οἱ πειθόμενοι αὐτῷ λέγοντι, ὁ πατὴρ ὁ πέμψας με, μείζων μου ἐστί (Jo. xiv. 28). Hence he is called, lib. v. p. 258, δεύτερος θεός. Comm. in Joh. Tom. xiii. 25: τὸν σωτῆρα, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὑπερεχόμενον τοσοῦτον ἢ καὶ πλέον ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, ὅσῳ ὑπερέχει αὐτὸς καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα τῶν λοιπῶν.—ὁ υἱὸς οὐ συγκρίνεται καὶ οὐδὲν τῷ πατρί. Εἰκὼν γάρ ἐστι τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀπαύγασμα οὐ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἀϊδίου φωτὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀτμὶς οὐ τοῦ πατρὸς, ἀλλὰ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀπόῤῥοια εἰλικρινὴς τῆς παντοκρατορικῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσοπτρον ἀκηλίδωτον τῆς ἐνεργείας αὐτοῦ, δι' οὗ ἐσόπτρου Παῦλος καὶ Πέτρος, καὶ οἱ παραπλήσιοι αὐτοῖς βλέπουσι τὸν θεὸν, λέγοντος· ὁ ἑωρακως ἐμὲ ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα, τὸν πέμψαντά με. De princ. i. 2, 13: Οὕτω τοίνυν ἡγοῦμαι καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος καλῶς ἂν λεχθήσεσθαι, ὅτι εἰκὼν ἀγαθότητος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν, ἀλλ' οὐκ αὐτοαγαθόν· καὶ τάχα καὶ υἱὸς ἀγαθὸς, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἁπλῶς ἀγαθός. καὶ ὥσπερ εἰκών ἐστι τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο θεὸς, ἀλλ' οὐ περὶ οὗ λέγει αὐτὸς ὁ Χριστὸς "ἵνα γινώσκωσί σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν." οὕτως εἰκὼν ἀγαθότητος, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ἀπαραλλάκτως ἀγαθός.

[15] Orig. comm. in Joh. p. 306: Ἄλλοι δὲ τό, ἐξῆλθον ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, διηγήσαντο ἀντὶ τοῦ, γεγέννημαι ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, οἷς ἀκολουθεῖ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας φάσκειν τοῦ πατρὸς γεγεννῆσθαι τὸν υἱὸν, οἱονεὶ μειουμένου, καὶ λείποντος τῇ οὐσίᾳ, ᾗ πρότερον εἶχε.—ἀκολουθεῖ δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ σῶμα λέγειν τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν, καὶ διῃρῆσθαι τὸν πατέρα, ἅπερ ἐστὶ δόγματα ἀνθρώπων, μηδ' ὅναρ φύσιν ἀόρατον καὶ ἀσώματον πεφαντασμένων, οὖσαν κυρίως οὐσίαν κ. τ. λ. De princ. i. 2, 6, iv. 28. The Logos is indeed ἀπόῤῥοια τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, but not ἀπόῤῥοια τοῦ θεοῦ, Comm. in Joh. tom. xiii. 25 see above, not. 14.

[16] Origines in Jerem. hom. ix. 4: he is ἀπαύγασμα δόξης. Τὸ ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης οὐχὶ ἅπαξ γεγέννηται καὶ οὐχὶ γεννᾶται· ἀλλὰ ὅσον ἐστὶ τὸ φῶς ποιητικὸν τοῦ ἀπαυγάσματος, ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον γεννᾶται τὸ ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ. De princ. i. 2, 4: Est ita aeterna ac sempiterna generatio, sicut splendor generatur ex luce.

[17] Orig. de princ. i. 2, 6: filius utique natus ex patre est, velut quaedam voluntas ejus ex mente procedens. Et ideo ego arbitror, quod sufficere debeat voluntas patris ad subsistendum hoc quod vult pater. Vo-

that from eternity.[19] But he taught that the Holy Ghost was a creature created by the Son, as all other things.[20]

lens enim non alia via utitur, nisi quae consilio voluntatis profertur. Ita ergo et filii subsistentia generatur ab eo. Idem in Justiniani epist. ad Mennam (Mansi collect. concill. ix. p. 525): *οὗτος δέ ὁ υἱὸς ἐκ θελήματος τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθείς.*

[18] So already Clement, Redepenning's Origenes i. 109, Origenes in Genesin (ap. Eusebius contra Marcellum i. c. 4, ap. de la Rue ii. p. 1): *Οὐ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς πατὴρ εἶναι ἤρξατο, κωλυόμενος, ὡς οἱ γενόμενοι πατέρες ἄνθρωποι, ὑπὸ τοῦ μὴ δύνασθαί πω πατέρες εἶναι. Εἰ γὰρ ἀεί τέλειος ὁ θεὸς, καὶ πάρεστιν αὐτῷ δύναμις τοῦ πατέρα αὐτὸν εἶναι, καὶ καλὸν, αὐτὸν εἶναι πατέρα τοῦ τοιούτου υἱοῦ· τί ἀναβάλλεται, καὶ ἑαυτὸν τοῦ καλοῦ στηρίσκει, καὶ, ὡς ἔστιν εἰπεῖν, ἐξ οὗ δύναται πατὴρ εἶναι υἱοῦ. Τὸ αὐτὸ μέντοιγε καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος λεκτέον.* But according to Methodius ap. Photium cod. 235, Origen also asserted on like grounds *συναΐδιον εἶναι τῷ—θεῷ τὸ πᾶν.* Comp. De princ. i. 2, 2, iv. 28. The fragment of Origen ap. Athanasius de decretis syn. Nic. c. 27, is very like the last passage: *ὁμοιότης τυγχάνων τοῦ πατρὸς (ὁ υἱὸς) οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν. Πότε γὰρ ὁ θεὸς—ἀπαύγασμα οὐκ εἶχε τῆς ἰδιας δόξης, ἵνα τολμήσας τις ἀρχὴν δῷ εἶναι υἱοῦ πρότερον οὐκ ὄντος;—κατανοείτω γὰρ ὁ τολμῶν καὶ λέγων "ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν ὁ υἱός" ὅτι ἐρεῖ καὶ τό· σοφία ποτὲ οὐκ ἦν, καὶ λόγος οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ζωὴ οὐκ ἦν·* Orig. comm. in Joh. p. 33: *τό· υἱός μου εἶ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε, λέγεται πρὸς αὐτον ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ᾧ ἀεί ἐστι τὸ σήμερον.—ὁ συμπαρεκτείνων τῇ ἀγεννήτῳ καὶ ἀϊδίῳ αὐτοῦ ζωῇ—χρόνος ἡμέρα ἐστὶν αὐτῷ σήμερον, ἐν ᾗ γεγέννηται ὁ υἱός.* In Jeremiam hom. ix. (T. iii. p. 181): *οὐχὶ ἐγέννησεν ὁ πατὴρ τὸν υἱὸν, καὶ ἀπέλυσεν αὐτὸν ὁ πατὴρ ἀπὸ τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ γεννᾷ αὐτόν.* So, according to Plotinus, the *νοῦς* also has originated eternally from the One, and the expression generation denotes merely *αἰτίαν καὶ τάξιν,* Tennemann's Gesch. d. Philos. vi. 89.

[19] Every human term to express this production could not be a fit representative, but only an incomplete symbol. Thus, as far as the Logos was a being like to God, his origination was a *γεννᾶν,* so far as he was produced by the will of God a *ποιεῖν, κτίζειν.* Respecting Clement see Photius cod. 109: *τὸν υἱὸν εἰς κτίσμα κατάγει* (namely in the Hypotyposes). Even Rufinus de adulterat. libb. Origenis confesses: interdum invenimus aliqua in libris ejus (Clementis) capitula, in quibus filium Dei creaturam dicit; although he would fain regard these passages as spurious. Clemens strom. v. p. 699: *ἡ σοφία ἡ πρωτόκτιστος τῷ θεῷ.* So also Origenes Comm. in Joh. tom. i. 22: *κτίσας—ἔμψυχον σοφίαν ὁ θεός.* contra Celsum v. p. 357, the Son is *πρεσβύτατον πάντων τῶν δημιουργημάτων.* So also Justinian l. c. accuses Origen of calling the Son *κτίσμα,* de princip. lib. iv. These expressions were now generally used by others since in Prov. viii. 22: *Κύριος ἔκτισέ με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ* was a cardinal passage relating to the Logos. See Münter's Dogmengesch. i. 445.—The question whether the Son was of the divine essence was capable of receiving a twofold answer from the standing-point of Origen. De princip. iv. 36 according to the translation of Jerome (Epist. ad Avitum): Intellectualem rationabilemque naturam sentit Deus et unigenitus Filius ejus et Spiritus sanctus; sentiunt Angeli et potestates, caeteraeque virtutes; sentit inte-

4. The human body assumed by the Logos was a real body, but could not have been a common one. According to Clement, it was united immediately with the Logos, and therefore, as it required the Divine ἀπάθεια of the latter, without πάθη.[21] Origen taught expressly a human soul in the person of Christ, with which the Logos united itself directly.[22] Thus those πάθη were no stumbling-block to him, since the soul only was affected by them. On the contrary, in his opinion, the body of Christ,

rior homo qui ad imaginem et similitudinem Dei conditus est. Ex quo concluditur, Deum et haec quodammodo unius esse substantiae. Fragm. ex libris in Epist. ad Hebr. in the apology of Pamphilus: Christus—secundum similitudinem ejus vaporis, qui de substantia aliqua corporea procedit, sic etiam ipse ut quidam vapor exoritur de virtute ipsius Dei. —Sic nihilominus et secundum similitudinem corporalis aporrhoeae esse dicitur aporrhoea gloriae Omnipotentis pura quaedam et sincera. Quae utraeque similitudines manifestissime ostendunt, communionem substantiae esse Filio cum Patre. Aporrhoea enim ὁμοούσιος videtur i.e. unius substantiae cum illo corpore, ex quo est vel aporrhoea, vel vapor. Selecta in Psalm 135: ὁ σωτὴρ οὐ κατὰ μετουσίαν, ἀλλὰ κατ' οὐσίαν ἐστὶ θεός. On the other hand de oratione c. 50: ἕτερος κατ' οὐσίαν καὶ ὑποκείμενόν ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρός. Comp. Comm. in Joh. tom. ii. 18. The Son was of the divine essence, but did not partake of the divine essence of the Father.

[20] Origenes in Johann. i. 3 (de la Rue iv. p. 60): οἶμαι γὰρ, ὅτι τῷ μὲν φάσκοντι γενητὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον εἶναι, καὶ προϊεμένῳ τό "πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο," ἀναγκαῖον παραδέξασθαι, ὅτι τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐγένετο, πρεσβυτέρου παρ' αὐτὸ τοῦ λόγου τυγχάνοντος.—Ἡμεῖς τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις πειθόμενοι τυγχάνειν, τὸν πατέρα, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ ἀγέννητον μηδὲν ἕτερον τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι πιστεύοντες, ὡς εὐσεβέστερον καὶ ἀληθὲς, προσιέμεθα τό, πάντων διὰ τοῦ λόγου γινομένων, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα πάντων εἶναι τιμιώτερον, καὶ τάξει πάντων [perhaps πρῶτον] τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς διὰ χριστοῦ γεγενημένων. Καὶ τάχα αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ αἰτία τοῦ μὴ καὶ αὐτὸ υἱὸν χρηματίζειν τοῦ θεοῦ, μόνου τοῦ μονογενοῦς φύσει υἱοῦ ἀρχῆθεν τυγχάνοντος, οὗ χρῄζειν ἔοικε τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, διακονοῦντος αὐτοῦ τῇ ὑποστάσει, οὐ μόνον εἰς τὸ εἶναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ σοφὸν εἶναι, καὶ λογικὸν, καὶ δίκαιον κ. τ. λ. De princ. i. 3, 5: μείζων ἡ δύναμις τοῦ πατρὸς παρὰ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. πλείων δὲ ἡ τοῦ υἱοῦ παρὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ πάλιν διαφέρουσα μᾶλλον τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἡ δύναμις παρὰ τὰ ἄλλα ἅγια.

[21] Strom. vi. p. 775: Ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ σωτῆρος τὸ σῶμα ἀπαιτεῖν ὡς σῶμα τὰς ἀναγκαίας ὑπηρεσίας εἰς διαμονὴν, γέλως ἂν εἴη. Ἔφαγεν γὰρ οὐ διὰ τὸ σῶμα, δυνάμει συνεχόμενον ἁγίᾳ· ἀλλ' ὡς μὴ τοὺς συνόντας ἄλλως περὶ αὐτοῦ φρονεῖν ὑπεισέλθοι, ὥστερ ἀμέλει ὕστερον δοκήσει τινες αὐτὸν πεφανερῶσθαι ὑπέλαβον· αὐτὸς δὲ ἀπαξαπλῶς ἀπαθὴς ἦν, εἰς ὃν οὐδὲν παρεισδύεται κίνημα παθητικὸν, οὔτε ἡδονὴ, οὔτε λύπη. Comp. my Comm. qua Clementis Alex. et Origenis doctrinae de corpore Christi exponuntur. Gottingae 1837. 4.

[22] Origenes de princip. ii. 6, § 3: Hac ergo substantia animae inter Deum carnemque mediante (non enim possibile erat Dei naturam corpori sine mediatore misceri) nascitur Deus homo, illa substantia media existente, cui utique contra naturam non erat corpus assumere.

as an appropriate instrument of revelation was so constituted as either to conceal the majesty of the Logos from men, according to the degree of their merit, or to allow it to shine through with more or less radiance.[23] Clement as well as Origen decidedly opposed the Docetic views.[24]

5. The Christian sage (*ὁ γνωστικός*), in the way the Alexandrians represent him as a pattern, is said to be elevated above the simple believer, not merely by higher perception, but also by a higher virtue which is entirely dispassionate.[25] The aim of this virtue is likeness to God,[26] its basis, freedom from all the restraints of sensuality,[27] its character the highest disinterestedness.[28]

[23] In Matth. comment. series § 100: Venit traditio talis ad nos de Jesu, quoniam non solum duae formae in eo fuerunt, una quidem secundum quam omnes eum videbant, altera autem secundum quam transfiguratus est coram discipulis suis in monte:—sed etiam unicuique apparebat secundum quod fuerat dignus.—Et non mihi videtur incredibilis esse traditio haec, sive corporaliter propter ipsum Jesum, ut alio et alio modo videretur hominibus, sive propter ipsam Verbi naturam, quod non similiter cunctis apparet. Contra Celsum iv. 16: *Εἰσὶ γὰρ διάφοροι οἱονεὶ τοῦ Λόγου μορφαί, καθὼς ἑκάστῳ τῶν εἰς ἐπιστήμην ἀγομένων φαίνεται ὁ Λόγος, ἀνάλογον τῇ ἕξει τοῦ εἰσαγομένου, ἢ ἐπ' ὀλίγον προκόπτοντος, ἢ ἐπὶ πλεῖον κ. τ. λ.* My Comm. p. 15.

[24] Both have often been accused of holding docetic views even in ancient times. Then according to Photius cod. 109. Clement in his Hypotyposes is said to have taught directly, *μὴ σαρκωθῆναι τὸν λογον, ἀλλὰ δόξαι.* Modern writers, too, have discovered doceticism in the words of Clement: Coh. ad Graec. p. 86: *τὸ ἀνθρώπου προσωπεῖον ἀναλαβών καὶ σαρκὶ ἀναπλασάμενος τὸ σατήριον δρᾶμα τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος ὑπεκρίνετο.* See on the other side my Comm. quoted in note 21.

[25] Clem. strom. vi. p. 775: *κἂν γὰρ μετὰ λόγου γινόμενα τὰ προειρημένα (τὰ δοκοῦντα ἀγαθὰ τῶν παθητικῶν κινημάτων, οἷον θάρσος, ζῆλον, χαρὰν, ἐπιθυμίαν) ἀγαθά τις ἐκδέχηται, ἀλλ' οὖν γε ἐπὶ τοῦ τελείου οὐ παραδεκτέον.* p. 825: *ἡ ἐπίτασις τῆς κατὰ τὸν νόμον δικαιοσύνης τὸν γνωστικὸν δείκνυσιν.—τὶς—ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκρότητα τῆς πίστεως χωρήσας, τὴν γνῶσιν αὐτὴν,—ἀκροτάτης ὁμοίως τεύξεται τῆς κληρονομίας.*

[26] Clem. strom. iv. p. 632: *δυνατὸν, τὸν γνωστικὸν ἤδη γενέσθαι θεόν.* *Ἐγὼ εἶπα, θεοί ἐστε καὶ υἱοὶ ὑψίστου* (Psalm cii. 6). vi. p. 816: *τοὺς ἐπιγνόντας αὐτὸν υἱοὺς ἀναγορεύει καὶ θεούς.* Hence he calls the gnostic *θεοειδής, θεοείκελος, θεούμενος, θεοποιούμενος, ἐν σαρκὶ περιπολῶν θεός* (Strom. vii. p. 894), see Potter ad cohort. ad gentes p. 88, ad strom. iv. p. 633. Hofstede de Groot de Clem. Alex. p. 78, 86. Redepenning's Origenes i. 171.

[27] The body is called by Clem. strom. iv. p. 626 *τάφος*, vii. p. 854 *δεσμὸς σαρκικός*, by Origen according to Methodius ap Photium cod. 234 *δεσμὸς πῆς ψυχῆς*, Orig. de princ. i. 7, 5, see Hofstede de Groot p. 59 ss. Clem. strom. iv. p. 569: *ὁ τοίνυν τοῦ σώματος ἀπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς χωρισμὸς, ὁ*

6. The Alexandrians could not but be averse to sensual chiliasm. Clement does not allude to it. Origen, however, expressly opposes the chiliast expectations; and would have all the passages which appear to favour it interpreted allegorically.[29]

7. Since, in the view of the Alexandrians, the body is merely a prison of the true *I;* they also assumed that souls, at the time of the resurrection, should not resume the gross material body, but one of fine, incorruptible texture.[30]

To establish this system from the Holy Scriptures the Alexandrians availed themselves of the allegorical mode of interpretation which had been in use before. But after the interpretation of Scripture had been in this way a mere arbitrary play of fancy till now, Origen gained for himself the merit of reinstating the grammatical interpretation in its rights, by a more accurate distinction between the *literal,* the *moral,* and the *mystical (mystic-anagogic* and *mystic-allegorical)* sense.[31] In his

παρ' ὅλον τὸν βίον μελετώμενος τῷ φιλοσόφῳ, προθυμίαν κατασκευάζει γνωστικήν. Hence Clement requires of the gnostic ἐγκρατείαν, i.e. striving after ἀπάθεια, Keilii opusc. acad. ii. p. 761 ss. Daehne de γνώσει Clementis p. 105.

[28] Clem. strom. iv. p. 576: Δεῖν δ' οἶμαι μήτε διὰ φόβον κολάσεως, μήτε διά τινα ἐπαγγελίαν δόσεως, δι' αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ ἀγαθὸν, προσελκυσθέναι τῷ σωτηρίῳ λόγῳ. p. 626: εἴ γ' οὖν τις καθ' ὑπόθεσιν προθείη τῷ γνωστικῷ, πότερον ἑλέσθαι βούλοιτο τὴν γνῶσιν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἢ τὴν σωτηρίαν τὴν αἰώνιον,— οὐδὲ καθοτιοῦν διστάσας, ἕλοιτ' ἂν τὴν γνῶσιν τοῦ θεοῦ. De Wette christl. Sittenlehre. Th. 2. Erste Hälfte. S. 221.

[29] A spiritualising of chiliasm in the excerptis ex scriptis Theodoti (Clem. opp. vol. ii. p. 1004): οἱ γὰρ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων εἰς ἀγγέλους μεταστάντες χίλια ἔτη μαθητεύονται ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων κ. τ. λ. Orig. de princip. ii. 11, § 6: Puto enim, quod sancti quique discedentes de hac vita permanebunt in loco aliquo in terra posito, quem paradisum dicit scriptura divina, velut in quodam eruditionis loco, et, ut ita dixerim, auditorio vel schola animarum, &c. On the other hand, ibid. § 2: Quidam ergo laborem quodammodo intelligentiae recusantes, et superficiem quandam legis literae consectantes, et magis delectationi suae quodammodo ac libidini indulgentes, solius literae discipuli, arbitrantur repromissiones futuras in voluptate et luxuria corporis exspectandas: et propterea praecipue carnes iterum desiderant post resurrectionem tales, quibus manducandi, et bibendi, et omnia quae carnis et sanguinis sunt agendi numquam desit facultas, apostoli Pauli de resurrectione spiritalis corporis sententiam non sequentes. cf. Prologus in Cant. Cant.

[30] Clemens paedag. ii. p. 230: αὐτῇ καθαρᾷ τῇ σαρκὶ ἐπενδυσάμενοι τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν. Orig. de princ. ii. 10, 3 and c. 11 (see not. 29). cf. Guerike l. c. p. 164, 285.

[31] The leading principle of his hermeneutics Homil. v. in Levit. § 5: Triplicem in scripturis divinis intelligentiae inveniri saepe diximus mo-

commentaries he has furnished rich contributions towards the grammatical interpretation, by which means he has become the chief source for succeeding commentators.

§ 64.

(CONTINUATION)—ADHERENTS AND OPPOSERS OF ORIGEN.

Origen's peculiar opinions met even in his lifetime with as many opponents as friends,[1] and excited suspicion in many bishops.[2] He and his disciples, however, succeeded in combating and refuting many sensuous views and expectations which were then current among Christians. Thus some overvalued the importance of the body in the personality of man, so much as to suppose that the soul dies, and is again raised along with it.[3] Origen overthrew this error, when it appeared in *Arabia*.[4] To

dum, historicum, moralem, et mysticum. Unde et corpus inesse ei et animam et spiritum intelleximus. (Comp. Valentinus above § 45). His hermeneutical principles are laid down most fully in de princip. lib. iv. Porphyry's judgment on his allegories apud Eusebius h. e. vi. 19, 2. 3. amongst others: ἐχρῆτο δὲ καὶ Χαιρήμονος τοῦ Στωϊκοῦ, Κορνοῦτου τε ταῖς βίβλοις· παρ' ὧν τὸν μεταληπτικὸν τῶν παρ' Ἕλλησι μυστηρίων γνοὺς τρόπον, ταῖς Ἰουδαϊκαῖς προσῆψε γραφαῖς. Comp. Mosheim comm. de rebus Christ. ante Const. M. p. 629. J. A. Ernesti de Origene interpretationis librorum SS. grammaticae auctore (opusc. philol. et crit. Lugd. Bat. 1764, p. 288 ss). Redepenning's Origenes i. 290. [Davidson's Hermeneutics p. 97 ff.]

[1] Origenes hom. xxv. in Lucam: Plerique dum plus nos diligunt quam meremur, haec jactant et loquuntur, sermones nostros doctrinamque laudantes, quae conscientia nostra non recipit. Alii vero tractatus nostros calumniantes, ea sentire nos criminantur, quae numquam sensisse nos novimus. Sed neque hi qui plus diligunt, neque illi qui oderunt, veritatis regulam tenent, et alii per dilectionem, alii per odium mentiuntur.

[2] Euseb. h. e. vi. 36: γράφει δὲ καὶ Φαβιανῷ τῷ κατὰ Ῥώμην ἐπισκόπῳ, ἑτέροις τε πλείστοις ἄρχουσιν ἐκκλησιῶν περὶ τῆς κατ' αὐτὸν ὀρθοδοξίας. Hieron. Ep. 41 ad Pammach. et Oceanum: Ipse Origenes in epistola, quam scribit ad Fabianum Romanae urbis episcopum, poenitentiam agit cur talia scripserit, et causas temeritatis in Ambrosium refert, quod secreto edita in publicum protulerit.

[3] So also Tatian (Orat. ad Gr. c. 21). Comp. Daniel's Tatianus p. 226.

[4] Eusebius vi. 37: ἔλεγον, τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν ψυχὴν τέως μὲν κατὰ τὸν ἐνεστῶτα καιρὸν ἅμα τῇ τελευτῇ συναπολήγειν τοῖς σώμασι καὶ συνδιαφθείρεσ-

his most distinguished disciple *Dionysius* (president of the catechetical school from 233, from 248 bishop in Alexandria, † 265)[5] belongs the merit of having victoriously continued in the east the opposition to chiliasm begun by his master. An opportunity for this was furnished to him by an Egyptian bishop, *Nepos*, who in the ἔλεγχος Ἀλληγορισταῖν insisted particularly on the literal acceptation of the Apocalypse, and the description of the millennium contained in it. Doubtless the Decian persecution which soon followed contributed to procure many advocates to a view which furnished so strong motives to Christian stedfastness, especially in the province of *Arsinoe*. But after the persecution, Dionysius succeeded by oral representations and his work περὶ ἐπαγγελιῶν, not only in convincing that party of their error, but in banishing chiliasm entirely, even among the theologians of the eastern church.[6] Similar opposition he presented to *Sabellius*. It is true, that in trying to develope more precisely the Origenist distinctions as adverse to Sabellius' doctrine of the Trinity, he gave offence by designating the Logos a creature of the Father,[7] and was therefore blamed by *the Romish Dionysius;* but the many-sided views of Origen's doctrines which he held, permitted him to cloak his view of the Logos as a created being, without altering it.[8] This convenient pliableness of ex-

θαι· αὖθις δέ ποτε κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἀναστάσεως καιρὸν σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀναβιώσεσθαι. On the origin of this opinion see § 29, note 10. The name Arabici first appears in Augustin. de haeres. c. 83, Θνητοψυχίται apud Joann. Damasc. haer. 90.

[5] The fragments of his writings are collected by Gallandius bibl. PP. T. iii. p. 481 ss. Simon de Magistris. Romae 1796, fol.

[6] Euseb. h. e. vii. 24, 25. Dionysius thought that the Apocalypse was written by a presbyter called John. Mynster diss. de Dionysii Alex. circa Apoc. Joann. sententia, hujusque vi in seriorem libri aestimationem. Hafn. 1826. Lücke's Einl. in die Offend. Joh. S. 321, 397.

[7] Omitted by Euseb. vii. 26. On the contrary, Athanasii περὶ Διονυσίου τοῦ Ἐπ. Ἀλ. liber. In the letter of Dionysius to Ammon bishop of Berenice and to Euphranor, it is said, Athanas. l. c. cap. 4: ποίημα καὶ γενητὸν εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ· μήτε δὲ φύσει ἴδιον, ἀλλὰ ξένον κατ' οὐσίαν εἶναι τοῦ πατρός· ὥσπερ ἐστὶν ὁ γεωργος πρὸς τὴν ἄμπελον (cf. Joh. xv. 1), καὶ ὁ ναυπηγὸς πρὸς τὸ σκάφος· καὶ γὰρ ὡς ποίημα ὤν, οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γένηται. According to chap. 14 the Arians also attributed to him the following assertions: οὐκ ἀεὶ ἦν ὁ Θεὸς πατήρ, οὐκ ἀεὶ ἦν ὁ υἱός·—ἀλλ' ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν. Comp. Martini Gesch. d. Dogma v. d. Gottheit Christi S. 198. Schleiermacher in his Zeitschrift iii. 402. Baur's Dreieinigkeit i. 309.

[8] Fragments of his "Ελεγχος καὶ ἀπολογία libb. iv., addressed to the Roman Dionysius, preserved in Athanasius and Basil, are collected by

pression in which Origen himself had led the way, is also found in other followers. *Theognostus* simply repeats the Origenist doctrine of the Logos in its different forms of presentation.[9] On the other hand, as used by the opponent of Paul of Samosata, *Gregory* (bishop of Neo-cæsarea from 244, † about 270), for whom later traditions have procured the surname *Thaumaturgus*,[10] this doctrine of the Logos appears to be set forth in entirely opposite modes of description.[11] It is highly probable, also, that *Hierax* of Leontopolis, at the end of this century, was formed in the school of Origen. His allegorical interpretation, his rejection of the resurrection of the body, and sensual notions of a future life, as also his disapprobation of marriage and the

Gallandius iii. 495, Routh reliqu. sacr. iii. 194 (in the second fragment of the first book, the variation in the text from Euthym. Zygab. Panoplia apud Gallandius T. xiv. App. p. 118 is to be compared). Dionysius declares here lib. i.: οὐ γὰρ ἦν ὅτε ὁ Θεὸς οὐκ ἦν πατήρ. Then he asserts it is a fabrication of his opponents that he ever denied, τὸν Χριστὸν ὁμοούσιον εἶναι τῷ Θεῷ· εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦτό φημι μὴ εὑρηκέναι, μηδ' ἀνεγνωκέναι που τῶν ἁγίων γραφῶν, ἄλλα γε τὰ ἐπιχειρήματά μου τὰ ἐξῆς, ἃ σεσιωπήκασι, τῆς διανοίας ταύτης οὐκ ἀπᾴδει. Comp. § 63, note 19. Martini S. 203 ff.

[9] Photii bibl. cod. 106: in his hypotyposes υἱὸν δὲ λέγων, κτίσμα αὐτὸν ἀποφαίνει, καὶ τῶν λογικῶν μόνον ἐπίστασθαι. Respecting the origin of the Logos a fragment apud Athanasius de decretis Syn. Nicaenae c. 25: οὐκ ἔξωθέν τίς ἐστιν ἐφευρεθεῖσα ἡ τοῦ υἱοῦ οὐσία, οὐδὲ ἐκ μὴ ὄντων ἐπεισήχθη· ἀλλὰ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας ἔφυ, ὡς τοῦ φωτὸς τὸ ἀπαύγασμα, ὡς ὕδατος ἀτμίς· (οὔτε γὰρ τὸ ἀπαύγασμα, οὔτε ἡ ἀτμὶς αὐτὸ τὸ ὕδωρ ἐστίν, ἢ αὐτὸς ὁ ἥλιος, οὔτε ἀλλότριον·) ἀλλὰ ἀπόῤῥοια τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας, οὐ μερισμὸν ὑπομεινάσης τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας.

[10] Writings: Εἰς Ὠριγένην προσφωνητικὸς καὶ πανηγυρικὸς λόγος. Ἐπιστολὴ κανονική. Fragments in Ang. Maji spicilegium Rom. vol. iii. Two confessions of faith have been also attributed to him, although without doubt they are supposititious, a short Symbolum which he is said to have received from the apostle John who appeared to him (Walchii bibl. symbol. vetus p. 14. Martini S. 231), and ἡ κατὰ μέρος πίστις (i. e. plenior ac particulatim concepta, which was formerly known only in the Latin translation of Turrianus, and published in Greek by Sirmond in not. ad Facundam x. 6, and in Maji scriptt. vett. nova coll. vii. i. 170), whose genuineness Salig de Eutychianismo ante Eutychen p. 136 sought in vain to defend. See Martini S. 233. His life by Gregory Nyssene. Opp. omnia una cum vita ed. G. Vossius, Mogunt. 1604. 4.

[11] Basilii M. epist. 210 (al. 64) § 5: (Sabelliani) καθήκαν δέ τινα πεῖραν δι' ἐπιστολῆς, καὶ πρὸς τον ὁμόψυχον ἡμῶν Ἀνθιμον τὸν Τυάνων ἐπίσκοπον, ὡς ἄρα Γρηγορίου εἰπόντος ἐν ἐκθέσει πίστεως, πατέρα καὶ υἱον ἐπινοίᾳ μεν εἶναι δύο, ὑποστάσει δε ἕν. τοῦτο δε, ὅτι οὐ δογματικῶς εἴρηται, ἀλλ' ἀγωνιστικῶς ἐν τῇ προς Αἰλιανον διαλέξει, οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν συνιδεῖν.—διο δὴ καὶ πολλὰς ἂν εὕροις ἐκεῖ φωνὰς, τὰς νῦν τοῖς αἱρετικοῖς μεγίστην ἰσχὺν παρεχομένας, ὡς το κτίσμα, καὶ το ποίημα, καὶ εἴ τι τοιοῦτον. Martini S. 233 ff.

use of flesh and wine, point rather to a maintenance of Origenist principles carried out to extremes, than to a Manichaean origin, which latter Epiphanius has inferred only from a few external points of resemblance.[12] At the end of this period appeared *Methodius*, bishop of *Olympus* (or Patara), afterwards of *Tyre* (martyred 311) as a violent opponent of Origen, defending in a work περὶ ἀναστάσεως, the doctrine of the resurrection of the present body, and in another περὶ τῶν γενητῶν attacking the notion of an endless succession of worlds.[13] But, on the other hand, Origen found warm defenders in *Pamphilus* (martyred 309) and *Eusebius Pamphili*, both presbyters in Caesarea.[14] Among the multitude, report had often distorted already the peculiar principles of Origen, and by that means awakened blind hatred against him;[15] but among the learned, respect for this

[12] Only authority Epiphan. haer. 67. Mosheim de rebus Christ. ante Const. p. 903 ss.

[13] Fragments in Epiphan. haer. 64. Photii bibl. cod. 234—236, in Maji scriptt. vett. nova coll. vii. i. 49, 92, 102. Walch's Ketzerhist. vii. 404. In a later dialogue, Ξένων, he is said to have changed and become the admirer of Origen (Socrat. h. e. vi. 13). Other works: περὶ αὐτεξουσίου. Symposion decem virginum etc. Opp. ed. Fr. Combefisius. Paris 1644. fol.

[14] Pamphilus wrote in captivity. See Apologia pro Origene, in five books, to which Eusebius added a sixth book. Only the first book is extant in Rufinus's Latin translation, and Greek fragments in Photius cod. 118 (see Origenis Opp. ed. de la Rue T. iv. App. p. 17). Pamphilus and Eusebius published conjointly the hexaplar septuagint—Pamphilus's library in Caesarea.

[15] Pamphili apologiae praefatio ad Confessores ad metalla Palaestinae damnatos: Nihil mirum, fratres, videmini mihi esse perpessi, quod ita vos Origenis subterfugit intellectus, ut vos quoque ea aestimetis de illo, quae et alii nonnulli: qui sive per imperitiam sui, qua non valent sensus ejus altitudinem contueri, sive pravitate mentis, qua studium gerunt non solum dicta ejus incusare, verum etiam adversus eos, qui haec legunt, hostiles inimicitias sumere, tam pertinaciter id agentes, ut nulla prorsus venia eos dignos haberi putent, ne ea quidem, quam impertire solent, verbi gratia, his qui vel Graecorum saecularium libros, vel nonnunquam etiam haereticorum, percunctandi atque agnoscendi studio decurrunt. Miramur in tantum temeritatis aliquos esse provectos, ut, qui se ita humilitate judicat, adstruant, quod ab illis dicta ejus vel libri pro sermonibus apostolicis vel dictis propheticis habeantur, aut quod ille ipse vel Prophetis vel Apostolis ab aliquo comparetur. Multos invenias, quos si interroges, in quibus libris aut in quibus locis dicta sint haec, quae arguunt, confitentur, se quidem nescire ea, de quibus affirmant, nec legisse unquam, audisse autem alios dicentes. The calumnies which Pamphilus refuted are these (cap. 5): Prima, ille est, quod ajunt, eum

great man was pretty general. He appears to have enjoyed undivided esteem, particularly in Egypt.[16]

§ 65.

OTHER DISTINGUISHED TEACHERS OF THE EASTERN CHURCH.

While at Alexandria Scripture interpretation was made to subserve the purpose of speculation, we find in Syria and the neighbouring provinces, favoured by the linguistic relations of these lands, the first traces of that more independent historico-grammatical and critical treatment of the Scriptures, by which the east was so much distinguished in the fourth and fifth centuries.[1] Of their writers we are acquainted, though very imperfectly, with *Julius Africanus* in *Nicopolis, (Emmaus)* probably a presbyter (about 230) a friend of Origen, the first Christian chronographer;[2] and two presbyters of Antioch, *Doro-*

innatum dicere filium Dei. Secunda, quod dicunt per prolationem, secundum Valentini fabulas, in subsistentiam venisse filium Dei dicere. Tertia, quae his omnibus valde contraria est, quod dicunt eum, secundum Artemon vel Paulum Samosatenum, purum hominem, id est, non etiam Deum dicere Christum filium Dei. Post (iv.), ista est, quae istis omnibus adversatur (caeca enim est malitia), quod dicunt eum dicere, *δοκήσει* i.e. putative tantum et per allegoriam, non etiam secundum ea, quae per historiam referuntur, gesta esse omnia, quae a Salvatore gesta sunt. Alia (v.), quoque criminatio est, qua asserunt, eum duos Christos praedicare. Addunt (vi.), illud quoque, quod historias corporales, quae per omnem S. Scripturam referuntur de gestis Sanctorum, penitus deneget. Sed et (vii.), de resurrectione mortuorum, et de impiorum poenis non levi impugnant eum calumnia, velut negantem peccatoribus inferenda esse supplicia. Quidam vero (viii.), disputationes ejus vel opiniones, quas de animae statu vel dispensatione disseruit, culpant. Ultima vero omnium (ix.), est criminatio illa, quae cum omni infamatione dispergitur, *μετενσωματώσεως*, i.e. quod humanas animas in muta animalia, vel serpentes vel pecudes asserat transmutari post mortem, et quod etiam ipsae mutorum animalium animae rationabiles sint.

[16] In Justiniani epist. ad Mennam (apud Mansi ix. p. 504) very unfavourable statements are made respecting Origen by Bishop Peter of Alexandria (martyred 311); but they have been borrowed from the uncertain Actis Petri Alex. See Tillemont mémoires T. iii. p. 589.

[1] Münter on the Antiochenian school in Stäudlin's and Tzschirner's Archiv. f. Kirchengesch. Bd. 1. St. 1. S. 1 ff.

[2] *Χρονογραφιῶν πέντε σπουδάσματά*—*Ἐπιστολὴ περὶ τῆς κατὰ Σωσάνναν ἱστορίας* (together with the reply of Origen appended to the dial. c. Marcionitas ed. Wetstein)—*Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἀριστείδην* (on the genealogies of

theus (about 290),[3] and *Lucian* who suffered martyrdom in Nicomedia, A.D. 311.[4] Because *Arius* and his most distinguished friends[5] proceeded from the school founded by Lucian at Antioch, the latter has often in later times been considered the father of Arianism.[6] Of the critical merits which belonged to him and his contemporary *Hesychius*,[7] in settling the text of the Holy Scriptures, after the example of Origen, it is to be regretted that very imperfect accounts have been preserved.[8]

Christ in Matthew and Luke partly preserved in Euseb. h. e. i. c. 7; another fragment, ex. Mss. Vindob. et Coisl., first printed in Routh reliqu. sacr. ii. p. 114). All these remains in Routh. l. c. p. 105 ss. Later oriental writers also attribute to him a Comm. in Evangelia, Assemani bibl. Orient. p. 129, 158.

[3] Euseb. vii. 32, 1: λόγιος ἀνήρ.—φιλόκαλὸς δ' οὗτος περὶ τὰ θεῖα γεγονὼς, καὶ τῆς Ἑβραίων ἐπεμελήθη γλώττης· ὡς καὶ αὐταῖς ταῖς Ἑβραϊκαῖς γραφαῖς ἐπιστημόνως ἐντυχάνειν. ἦν δ' οἵτος τῶν μάλιστα ἐλευθερίων [παιδειῶν] προπαιδείας τε τῆς καθ' Ἕλληνας οὐκ ἄμοιρος. § 2, Τούτου [μὴ] μετρίως τὰς γραφὰς ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας διηγουμένου κατηκούσαμεν.

[4] Euseb. viii. 13, ix. 6. ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα ἄριστος βίῳ τε ἐγκρατὴς καὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς μαθήμασι συγκεκροτήμενος. Hieronymus catal. c. 77: Lucianus, vir disertissimus, Antiochenae Ecclesiae presbyter, tantum in Scripturarum studio laboravit, ut usque nunc quaedam exemplaria Scripturarum Lucianea nuncupentur. Feruntur ejus de fide libelli, et breves ad nonnullos epistolae.

[5] The bishops Eusebius of Nicomedia, Maris of Chalcedon, Theognis of Nicaea, Leontius of Antioch, Antonius of Tarsus, &c. See Philostorgius ii. 14.

[6] Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, writes of him (about 320, in Theodoreti hist. eccl. i. 3): ὃν (Παῦλον τὸν Σαμοσατέα) διαδεξάμενος Λουκιανός, ἀποσυνάγωγος ἔμεινε τριῶν ἐπισκόπων πολυετεῖς χρόνους. ὧν τῆς ἀσεβείας τὴν τρύγα ἐρρόφησάν τε καὶ Ἀχιλλᾶς κ. κ. λ. The Eusebians appealed to a confession of faith by Lucian, Sozomen iii. 5. Still he is considered by Eusebius, Athanasius, Jerome, Chrysostom (comp. his panegyric on him, tom. i. hom. 46), &c., as a holy martyr, and is so regarded by the Romish church at this day.

[7] Probably the Egyptian Bishop Hesychius, who, according to Eusebius, h. e. viii. 13, 4, suffered martyrdom in the year 311.

[8] Hieron. adv. Rufin. lib. ii. (ed. Martian. T. iv. p. ii. p. 425): Alexandria et Aegyptus in Septuaginta suis Hesychium laudat auctorem. Constantinopolis usque ad Antiochiam Luciani Martyris exemplaria probat. Mediae inter has provinciae Palaestinos codices legunt, quos ab Origene elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt; totusque orbis haec inter se trifaria varietate compugnat. Comp. Eichhorn's Einleit. in das A. T. (4te Aufl. 1823) Bd. 1. S. 506 ff. Hieron. praef. in iv. Evang. ad Damasum: De novo nunc loquor Testamento. Praetermitto eos codices, quos a Luciano et Hesychio nuncupatos, paucorum hominum asserit perversa contentio: quibus utique nec in toto veteri Instrumento post lxx. interpretes emendare quid licuit: nec in Novo

To this oriental literature appears also to belong most nearly the literary labours of *Hippolytus* (about 240).[9]

profuit emendasse, cum multarum gentium linguis Scriptura ante translata doceat, falsa esse, quae addita sunt. Comp. Hug's Einl. in d. N. T. (3te Aufl. 1826) Th. 1. S. 196 ff. 231 ff.

[9] Concerning him and his numerous writings, among which the treatise περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα, which adduced the first Canon paschalis (see on it Ideler's Chronologie ii. 213), was the most important, see Eusebius vi. 20, 22. Hieronymus in catal. c. 61. Both call him bishop, but do not know in what place. Jerome also designates him as a martyr, comm. ad Matth. praef., and so also later writers call him Episcopum et Martyrem. Prudentius περὶ στεφάνων hymn. xi. relates the martyrdom of one Hippolytus. The same person was a Presbyter among the Novatians, stood in high repute with his own party (the heathen called out, v. 80: ipsum Christicolis esse caput populi), but in view of death he repented of his taking part in the schism, and exhorted his own disciples, who accompanied him in great numbers, to return to the Catholic communion (v. 27 ss.) Thus he became a Catholic martyr at Portus Romanus (probably under Valerian 258), and his bones were dug up in the vicinity of Rome (v. 151). At the time of Prudentius a splendid martyrium was here dedicated to him (v. 183), and his memory was celebrated on the ides of August (v. 232). In the eighth century Hadrian I. restored this Coemeterium b. Hippolyti Martyris (Liber pontificalis in vita Hadr. I.) At the same place the statue of Hippolytus was found 1551, on whose cathedra the Canon paschalis and a catalogue of his writings are inscribed. It belongs probably to the sixth century (Beschreibung der Stadt Rom von Platner, Bunsen, Gerhard, u. Röstell ii. ii. 329), and proves that at that time the ancient writer and the martyr were looked upon as the same person. In the later martyrologies a fragment of genuine tradition must be preserved concerning him. Usuardus, Ado, Notker, and others, have the following on the 30th January:—Apud Antiochiam passio b. Hippolyti Martyris, qui Novati schismate aliquantulum deceptus, operante gratia Christi correctus, ad caritatem ecclesiae rediit, pro qua et in qua illustre martyrium consummavit. Petrus Damianus lib. i. epist. 9, ad Nicolaum ii. says: Beatus quoque Nonus Martyr, qui et Hippolytus—postquam denique nonnullos sanctarum expositionum libros luculenter explicuit, tandem Episcopatum deseruit, de Antiochenis partibus, unde erat oriundus, abscessit, Romanos fines appetiit; and then relates his death and burial in Portus Romanus. The result of our inquiry into the history of Hippolytus may be stated. Novatian found great favour particularly in Antioch. The bishop Fabius, and many others were friendly to him (Euseb. vi. 44, 46, see below § 72, note 8). One of them, the presbyter Hippolytus, determined to travel in person to Rome. Probably he was the same Hippolytus who, while travelling over Alexandria, took with him to Rome the ἐπιστολὴ διακονική of Dionysius of Alexandria (Euseb. vi. 46. Eusebius here names him without any other specifying circumstance, after having spoken before of one Hippolytus). In Rome he attached himself to the Novatians, and attained to great repute. The separation

II. THEOLOGY IN THE WEST.

§ 66.

The Latin church, which had been hitherto little more than an

from the church, however, made him suspicious, until the prospect of immediate death decided him to return to the Catholic Church. His memory was celebrated at Antioch, his native city, on the 30th January; at Rome on the 13th August. The later martyrologies have adopted both days, and so made two Hippolytuses out of one. The great reputation which Hippolytus obtained as an ecclesiastical historian misled Eusebius, when he represents him to have been a bishop. Jerome followed him in this particular. The clergyman who was martyred at Portus Romanus may have been previously a bishop somewhere in the east. Although, however, Prudentius correctly designates Hippolytus a presbyter, yet all later writers call him bishop, and conjecture different places where he was such. The Greeks naturally looked for this place in the part where he had suffered, and regarded him sometimes as a bishop of Rome, after the example of Leontius; sometimes as a bishop of Portus Romanus, according to the Paschal Chronicle, Georgius Syncellus, Zonaras, and Nicephorus Callistus. The Romish bishop Gelasius, misled by Rufinus's translation of Euseb. vi. 20 (Beryllus—Episcopus fuit apud Bostram, Arabiae urbem maximam. Erat et nihilominus Hippolytus, qui et ipse aliquanta scripta dereliquit, Episcopus), thought that he was a metropolitan of Arabia, but maintained at the same time as an indubitable fact that he had come to Rome, and suffered martyrdom there. (The later legend dressed out this with other additions: Petrus Dam. l. c. qui, postquam triginta millia Saracenorum ad Christi fidem efficacissima praedicatione convertit etc.) In order to find a middle way between these different accounts, Steph. le Moyne conjectured that he was bishop of Portus Romanus (Aden) in Arabia Felix, and in this several have followed him; but this attempt to reconcile errors could only be a new error itself, since Christianity came for the first time into Arabia Felix in the fourth century. With the results already given agrees very well what may be gathered from the writings of Hippolytus. 1st, Novatianism is as little found in them as in the works of Novatian himself. They were probably composed earlier. 2d, According to Photius cod. 121, Hippolytus's *σύνταγμα κατὰ αἱρέσεων* was an extract from the work of Irenaeus. But Photius infers too much from a passage of that writing when he makes him a disciple of Irenaeus. 3. Jerome, cat. c. 61, enumerates among the works of Hippolytus *προσομιλίαν* de laude Domini Salvatoris, in qua praesente Origene se loqui in Ecclesia significat. What follows: In hujus aemulationem Ambrosius —cohortatus est Origenem, in scripturas Commentarios scribere, is founded merely on a misunderstanding of the expression *ἐξ ἐκείνου* scil. *χρόνου*, which forms a transition in Euseb. vi. c. 22 to chapter 23.) 4.

appendage to the Greek, now attained to more independence and individuality, after it had materially enlarged itself, and since the Latin language had been more adapted, particularly by *Tertullian*,[1] to the expression of Christian ideas, and had become the usual written language of the western Christians. As the speculative tendency of the Greeks prevailed in the Greek church, so the practical character of the Romans gave expression to itself in the Latin church in the inclination to cultivate chiefly the science of constitutional rights and jurisprudence. While the Greek language now disappeared from the western church, the lively interest of the latter in the new developments of the theology of the east also ceased. In proportion as the Greek theology of the second century was adopted and represented with material grossness in the writings of Tertullian, so was it held fast in the western church, in the third century. Philosophy was too much hated by the *westerns*,[2] and their inter-

The numerous exegetical writings (see apud Jerome) point to the east. 5. The Ἀπολογία ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγελίου καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως and περὶ χαρισμάτων, marked upon the cathedra, are either directed against the Alogi in Asia Minor (§ 48, note 15), or against the opponents of the Montanists in Rome (§ 59, note 9). For this last supposition appears to speak the notice of Ebedjesu († 1318) in Assemani bibl. orient. T. iii. p. i., that among the Chaldeans Hippolyti capita adv. Caium were in existence. (Comp. Lücke's Einl. in d. Offenb. Joh. S. 316.) C. Gu. Haenell de Hippolyto comm. Gottingae 1838. 4. (looks upon him as a bishop of Bostra). E. J. Kimmel de Hippolyti vita et scriptis p. i. Jenae 1839. 8. (according to him, Hippolytus was an oriental, educated in Alexandrian learning (?), and bishop of Portus Romanus at Rome.) L. F. W. Seinecke über d. Leben u. die Schriften des Bisch. Hippolytus, in Illgen's Zeitschr. f. d. hist. Theol. 1842, iii. 48. (he also supposes him bishop of Portus Romanus). Hippolyti opera ed. J. A. Fabricius. Hamb. 1716. 18. 2 voll. fol.

[1] Respecting him see above § 59. He wrote in Greek, de baptismo (Tert. de bapt. c. 15), de spectaculis (de cor. mil. c. 6), and de virginibus velandis de virg. vel. c. 1). None of these works is now extant. M. E. F. Leopold über die Ursachen der verdorbenen Latinität der Kirchenväter, bes. des Tertullians, in Illgen's Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol. viii. ii. 12.

[2] Although they had unconsciously received many Platonic ideas into the Greek theology of the second century. Tertullianus de praescr. haeret. c. 7: Quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis? quid Academiae et Ecclesiae? quid haereticis et Christianis? Nostra institutio de porticu Salomonis est: qui et ipse tradiderat, dominum in simplicitate cordis esse quaerendum. Viderint, qui stoicum, et platonicum, et dialecticum Christianismum protulerunt. Nobis curiositate opus non est post Christum Jesum, nec inquisitione post Evangelium. Cum credimus, nihil

pretation of Scripture, from ignorance of the original languages, was too imperfect to induce them to develope the Grecian theology intelligently. Hence, there arose in the occidental church an aversion to all theological speculation,[3] and *a doctrinal stability* which was urged on by the Greek church only to negative and unconscious improvements. It is true that Montanism, having continued for a long time unmolested in the west, had been condemned, as far as its peculiar doctrines were concerned, in the beginning of this period; but its spirit had obtained so firm a sympathy with the disposition of the westerns to cultivate the science of external ecclesiastical ordinances, that its continuance may be still recognised in a sensuous acceptation of Christianity, and the high value set upon external discipline. *Thascius Caecilius Cyprianus*, at first a rhetorician in Carthage, (converted to Christianity from 245, bishop at Carthage 248, suffered martyrdom 258) left behind several small works apologetic and admonitory, and many letters which refer for the

desideramus ultra credere. Hoc enim prius credimus, non esse, quod ultra credere debemus. De anima c. 3: philosophis—patriarchis, ut ita dixerim, haereticorum. De carne Christi c. 5: Natus est dei filius: non pudet, quia pudendum est. Et mortuus est dei filius: prorsus credibile est, quia ineptum est. Et sepultus, resurrexit: certum est, quia impossibile. Cf. de anima lib., apologet. c. 46, adv. Marcion. v. c. 19, de testimonio animae c. 1. Ritter's Gesch. d. christl. Philos. i. 362.

[3] Tertull. de praescript. c. 7, (see note 2). Cap. 9: Unius porro et certi instituti infinita inquisitio non potest esse: quaerendum est, donec invenias: et credendum, ubi inveneris: et nihil amplius nisi custodiendum, quod credidisti: dum insuper credis, aliud non esse credendum. Cap. 14: Caeterum manente forma ejus (regulae fidei) in suo ordine, quantum libet quaeras et tractes, et omnem libidinem curiositatis effundas, si quid tibi videtur vel ambiguitate pendere, vel obscuritate obumbrari. Est utique frater aliquis doctor, gratia scientiae donatus: est aliquis inter exercitatos conversatus aliquid tecum, curiosius tamen, quaerens: novissime ignorare melius est, ne quod non debeas noris. Fides, inquit, tua te salvum fecit (Luc. 18, 42): non exercitatio scripturarum. Fides in regula posita est, habens legem et salutem de observatione legis: exercitatio autem in curiositate consistit, habens gloriam solam de peritiae studio. Cedat curiositas fidei, cedat gloria saluti. Certe aut non obstrepant, aut quiescant. Adversus regulam nihil scire omnia scire est. A decided rejection of all secret tradition ibid. c. 22. Solent dicere (haeretici), non omnia Apostolos scisse: eadam agitati dimentia, qua rursus convertunt, omnia quidem Apostolos scisse, sed non omnia omnibus tradidisse. In utroque Christum reprehensioni injicientes, qui aut minus instructos, aut parum simplices Apostolos miserit. cf. cap. 25, and 26.

most part to matters of church government and discipline.[4] There is still preserved a perfectly orthodox work *de trinitate*,[5] by his contemporary *Novatian*, a Roman presbyter and founder of a sect. Eighty moral precepts in verse by the African *Commodianus* (about 270) are not unimportant in the history of morals.[6] *Arnobius*, a rhetorician in *Sicca*, formerly an enemy to Christianity, wrote (about 303) his disputationes adv. gentes libb. vii.[7] His pupil in rhetoric, *L. Caelius Lactantius Firmianus* (Cicero Christianus) an Italian by birth, wrote in Nicomedia, during the Diocletian persecution, his institutionum divinarum libb. vii.[8] He was afterwards preceptor of Crispus, eldest son of Constantine the Great, († about 330).

[4] Vita et passio Cypriani per Pontium ejus diaconum scripta, in Ruinart, and prefixed to the editions of Cyprian. Jo. Pearsonii annales Cyprianici prefixed to Fell's edition. Prudentii Marani vita S. Cypr. prefixed to Baluzius's edition. La vie de St. Cyprien (par Jacq. Gervaise), Paris 1717. 4. Th. C. Cyprianus, dargestellt von D. F. W. Rettberg. Göttingen 1831. 8. Bähr's christl. römische Theologie S. 50. Möhler's Patrologie i. 809.—His works: In the year 246: Lib. ad Donatum.—247: De idolorum vanitate.—248: Testimoniorum ad Quirinum adv. Judaeos, libb. 3. De habitu virginum.—251: De unitate ecclesiae. De lapsis.—252: De oratione dominica. De mortalitate. Exhort. ad Martyrium.—253: Lib. ad Demetrianum.—254: De opere et eleemosynis. —255: De bono patientiae.—256: De zelo et livore. Besides these 83 letters Opp. ed. Nic. Rigaltius. Paris 1648, fol. Joannes Fell, Oxon. 1682. (Bremae 1690. Amstel. 1700.) fol. Steph. Baluzius, Paris. 1726. (Venet. 1728.) fol. Opp. genuina cur. D. J. H. Goldhorn. P. II. Lips. 1838. 39. 8.

[5] ed. Ed. Welchmann. Oxon. 1724. (iter. 1728.) 8. Also appended to Rigalt's edition of Tertullian. Bähr S. 47.

[6] Instructiones ed. Nic. Rigaltius. Tulli Leuc. 1650. 4. Bibl. PP. Lugd. T. xxvii. p. 12, C. S. Schurzfleisch. Viteberg. 1705.

[7] Hieron. cat. 79, in Chronico ad ann. xx. imperii Constantini. His work ed. cum recensione viri celeberrimi (Cl. Salmasii) et integris omnium commentariis. Lugd. Bat. 1651. 4.—recogn. Jo. Conr. Orellius P. II. Lips. 1816. Additamentum, Lips. 1817. 8. Des Africaners Arnob. 7 Bücher wider die Heiden, übers. u. erläutert v. E. A. v. Besnard. Landshut 1842. 8. P. K. Meyer de ratione et argumento apologetici Arnobiani. Havniae 1815. 8. Bähr S. 66.

[8] Besides this: Epitome div. institt., de opificio Dei, de ira Dei. In a MS. Colbert. Baluzius found Lucii Cecilii liber de mortibus persecutorum, and first published it in Miscellan. tom. ii. p. 1. (1679). He correctly pronounced it the book of Lactantius, which Jerome mentions cat. c. 80, as De persecutione lib. and therefore it has been taken into all the later editions of Lactantius. Against le Nourry (Lucii Cecilii lib. de mortibus persec. ad Ms. denuo emendatus. acc. dissert. de libri auctore. Paris 1710. 8), who wishes to distinguish this Lucius Cecilius

The tendency of the western church to a stable unity could effect so little in the province of dogmatic theology, that even gnostic doctrines were still in many instances tolerated as harmless. It is true that *Hermogenes*, when he asserted the eternity of matter too strenuously, found an opponent in Tertullian;[9] but *Arnobius* gave utterance to Platonic and gnostic opinions respecting the soul and evil, without being molested;[10] and his disciple *Lactantius* taught a suspicious dualism,[11] without being

from Lactantius, see particularly N. de Lestocq disquis. in the edition of le Brun prefixed to tom. ii. p. 48 ss. Opp. ed. J. L. Bünemann. Lips. 1739. 8. Jo. Bapt. le Brun et Nic Lenglet Dufresnoy. Paris 1748. Tom. ii. 4. O. F. Fritzsche. P. ii. Lips. 1842. 44. 8. Bähr S. 72.

[9] Tertullianus adv. Hermogenem. Ritter's Gesch. d. christl. Philos. i. 178.

[10] For example, Arnobius ii. c. 15: Nihil est, quod nos fallat,—quod a novis quibusdam dicitur viris,—animas immortales esse, Deo rerum ac principi gradu proximas dignitatis, genitore illo ac patre prolatas etc. Cap. 62: Servare animas alius nisi Deus omnipotens non potest: nec praeterea quisquam est, qui longaevas facere, perpetuitatis possit et spiritum subrogare. (Comp. Platonis Timaeus ed. Bip. p. 325. Justinus, Tatianus, Theophilus, see Münscher's Dogmengesch. Bd. 2, S. 101 ff.) —Cap. 46 it is called immanis et scelerata persuasio, ut—Deus—aliquid fecerit claudum: and hence it is inferred, ut in sacrilegae crimen impietatis incurrat, quisquis ab eo conceperit hominem esse prognatum. Cap. 36: Discite ab eo, qui novit et protulit in medium, Christo, non esse animas regis maximi filias, nec ab eo, quemadmodum dicitur, generatas coepisse se nosse;—sed alterum quempiam genitorem his esse, dignitatis et potentiae gradibus satis plurimis ab Imperatore disjunctum, ejus tamen ex aula et eminentium nobilem sublimitate natalium (doubtless the Logos). Cap. 47: Non enim, si negemus, muscas, scarabeos, et cimices, nitedulas, curculiones, et tineas omnipotentis esse opus regis, sequaciter postulandum a nobis est, ut quis ea fecerit, instituerit que dicamus. Possimus enim nulla cum reprehensione nescire, quis et illis originem dederit, et obtinere, non esse Deo a superiore prolata tam supervacua, tam vana, tam ad nullas pertinentia rationes, quinimo aliquando et noxia, et necessarias importantia lacsiones. cf. cap. 48, 58, 61, 62. Comp. above § 44, note 4, 5. On the theology of Arnobius see Meyer de ratione apol. Arnob. p. 278.

[11] Lactant. institutt. div. ii. 8: Deus—antequam ordiretur hoc opus mundi,—produxit similem sui spiritum, qui esse virtutibus Dei Patris praeditus.—Deinde fecit alterum, in quo indoles divinae stirpis non permansit. Itaque suapte invidia tanquam veneno infectus est, et ex bono ad malum transcendit, suoque arbitrio, quod illi a Deo liberum datum fuerat, contrarium sibi nomen ascivit. Unde apparet, cunctorum malorum fontem esse livorem. Invidit enim illi antecessori suo, qui Deo Patri perseverando cum probatus, tum etiam carus est. Hunc ergo ex bono per se malum effectum Graeci διάβολον appellant, nos criminatorem vocamus, quod crimina, in quae ipse illicit, ad Deum deferat. God di-

attacked on account of it. As a certain theological coarseness is manifestly expressed in the western theology, so the same peculiarity is also exhibited in the sensuous mode of treating the traditional doctrines. Even in definitions of the essence of God, the western writers of this period are not able to disentangle themselves from the forms of a sensuous conception. They thought of the Deity himself as corporeal, and of the soul as literally his breath.[12] They also firmly maintained the resurrection of the same body, the millennium, which appears here almost in its most sensual form,[13] the condemnation of all who are not Christians, and the eternity of hell punishments. With regard to the Logos, they retained the old emanistic notions, both as to its origin, which was conceived for the most part in a very coarse

vided the dominion of the world with him, so that there fell to his share occidens, septentrio, tenebrae, frigus, &c., c. 9. H. J. Alt de dualismo Lactantiano diss. Vratislav. 1839. 8.

[12] Tertull. adv. Prax. 7: Quis enim negavit, deum corpus esse, etsi deus spiritus est? Spiritus enim corpus sui generis in sua effigie. Sed et si invisibilia illa, quaecunque sunt, habent apud deum et suum corpus et suam formam, per quae soli deo visibilia sunt: quanto magis quod ex ipsius substantia missum est (namely the λόγος), sine substantia non erit? c. 5: Es animal rationale, a ratjonali scilicet artifice non tantum factus, sed etiam ex substantia ipsius animatus. Lactant. de ira Dei c. 2: aliter de unica illa majestate sentiunt, quam veritas habet, qui aut figuram negant habere ullam Deum, aut nullo affectu commoveri putant (he holds the doctrine of God's wrath to be a fundamental truth of religion). In this the stoics had set the example, who regarded every thing which had efficiency as body. Comp. Tennemann's Gesch. d. Philol. iv. 39, 283. Seneca epist. 106, 117, quod facit, corpus est. The soul was universally looked upon as corporeal, with the exception of Origen.

[13] Commodiani Instruct. 43, 44, 80, ex. gr. Instr. 44:—

De coelo descendet civitas in anastasi prima,—
Venturi sunt illi quoque sub Antichristo qui vincunt
Robusta martyria, et ipsi toto tempore vivunt,—
Et generant ipsi per annos mille nubentes.

Instr. 80:—

Digniores, stemmate et generati praeclaro,
Nobilesque viri sub Antichristo devicto,
Ex praecepto Dei rursum viventes in aevo
Mille quidem annis ut serviant sanctis et Alto,
Sub jugo servili, ut portent victualia collo,
Ut iterum autem judicentur regno finito.

comp. Lactant. institutt. div. vii. c. 14—25. Among other things, he says, c. 24:—Tum qui erunt in corporibus vivi, non morientur, sed per eosdem mille annos infinitam multitudinem generabunt, et erit soboles eorum sancta et Deo cara. Qui autem ab inferis suscitabuntur, ii praeerunt viventibus velut judices. Gentes vero non extinguentur omnino: sed quaedam relinquentur in victoriam Dei, ut triumphentur a justis, ac subjugentur perpetuae servituti.

form,[14] as also its relation to the Father.[15] A remarkable stage of development as concerns this dogma is exhibited by *Dionysius*, bishop of Rome (259—270) whose education was Grecian, and who unites the Origenist idea of an eternal generation of the Logos with those emanistic notions.[16]

[14] Cf. Lactant. divin. instit. iv. 8: Quomodo igitur procreavit? Primum nec sciri a quoquam possunt, nec narrari opera divina, sed tamen sanctae literae docent, in quibus cautum est, illum Dei filium esse Dei sermonem, itemque ceteros angelos Dei spiritus esse. Nam sermo est spiritus cum voce aliquid significante prolatus. Sed tamen quoniam spiritus et sermo diversis partibus proferuntur, siquidem spiritus naribus, ore sermo procedit: magna inter hunc Dei filium ceterosque angelos differentia est. Illi enim ex Deo taciti spiritus exierunt, qui non ad doctrinam Dei tradendam, sed ad ministerium creabantur. Ille vero, quum sit et ipse spiritus, tamen cum voce ac sono ex Dei ore processit, sicut verbum, &c.—Merito igitur sermo et verbum Dei dicitur, quia Deus procedentem de ore suo vocalem spiritum, quem non utero sed mente conceperat, inexcogitabili quadam majestatis suae virtute ac potentia, in effigiem, quae proprio sensu ac sapientia vigeat, comprehendit, et alios item spiritus suos in angelos figuravit.

[15] Tertull. adv. Hermogenem c. 3: Et pater deus est, et judex deus est: non tamen ideo pater et judex semper, quia deus semper. Nam nec pater potuit esse ante filium, nec judex ante delictum. Fuit autem tempus, cum ei delictum et filius non fuit, quod judicem et qui patrem dominum faceret. Cap. 18: Ut (Deus sophiam) necessariam sensit ad opera mundi, statim eam condit et generat in semetipso. Adv. Praxean c. 26: Nulla res alicujus ipsa est, cujus est.—Et ideo spiritus Deus, et sermo Deus, quia ex Deo, non tamen ipse ex quo est. Quodsi deus, Dei tanquam substantiva res, non erit ipse Deus (αὐτόθεος): sed hactenus deus, quia ex ipsius Dei substantia, qua et substantiva res est, et ut portio aliqua totius.—Patrem et ipse adorat,—ignorans et ipse diem et horam ultimam, soli patri notam: disponens regnum discipulis, quo modo et sibi dispositum dicit a patre, &c. Adv. Marcionem ii. c. 27: Quaecunque exigitis Deo digna, habebuntur in patre invisibili, incongressibili, et placido, et, ut ita dixerim, philosophorum Deo. Quaecunque autem ut indigna reprehenditis, deputabuntur in filio, et viso, et audito, et congresso, arbitro patris et ministro, &c. Comp. Martini Gesch. d. Dogma v. d. Gottheit Christi in d. vier ersten Jahrh. S. 100 ff. With Tertullian agree Cyprian (see Martini S. 248 ff,), Novatian (l. c. S. 257 ff.), Lactantius (l. c. S. 268 ff.).

[16] Dionysii Rom. adv. Sabellianos fragmentum (apud Athanasius de decretis Nicaen. syn. c. 26: also in Constant. epist. Rom. Pont. ed. Schoenemann. p. 194 ss. Routh. reliqu. sacr. iii. p. 175 ss). First of all he rejects *τοὺς διαιροῦντας καὶ κατατέμνοντας—τὴν μοναρχίαν εἰς τρεῖς δυνάμεις τινὰς καὶ μεμερισμένας ὑποστάσεις καὶ θεότητας τρεῖς*, and asserts in opposition: *ἡνῶσθαι γὰρ ἀνάγκη τῷ θεῷ τῶν ὅλων τὸν θεῖον λόγον· ἐμφιλοχωρεῖν δε τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐνδιαιτᾶσθαι δεῖ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα· ἥδη καὶ τὴν θείαν τριάδα εἰς ἕνα, ὥσπερ εἰς κορυφήν τινα (τοι θεον τῶν ὅλων τον παντο-*

FOURTH CHAPTER.

ECCLESIASTICAL LIFE.

§ 67.

The changes in ecclesiastical life, the germs of which appeared in the second century, though not completely developed till the third, proceeded from certain ideas in particular. The idea of one catholic church out of which there is no salvation, received its full development from *Cyprian*,[1] and strove to give itself an

κράτορα λέγω) συγκεφαλαιοῦσθαί τε καὶ συνάγεσθαι πᾶσα ἀνάγκη. Then he censures τοὺς ποίημα τὸν υἱὸν εἶναι δοξάζοντας, καὶ γεγονέναι τὸν κύριον, ὥσπερ ἕν τι ὄντως γενομένων, νομίζοντας.—Βλάσφημον οὖν οὐ τὸ τυχὸν, μέγιστον μὲν οὖν, χειροποίητον τρόπον τινὰ λέγειν τὸν Κύριον. Εἰ γὰρ γέγονεν υἱὸς, ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν· ἀεὶ δὲ ἦν, εἴ γε ἐν τῷ πατρί ἐστιν, ὡς αὐτός φησι, καὶ εἰ λόγος καὶ σοφία καὶ δύναμις ὁ Χριστός.—ταῦτα δὲ δυνάμεις οὖσαι τοῦ Θεοῦ συγχύνουσιν· εἰ τοίνυν γέγονεν ὁ υἱὸς, ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν ταῦτα· ἦν ἄρα καιρὸς, ὅτε χωρὶς τούτων ἦν ὁ Θεός· ἀτοπώτατον δὲ τοῦτο. The expression κύριος ἔκτισέ με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ Prov. viii. 22 means: ἐπέστησε τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγονόσιν ἔργοις, γεγονόσι δὲ δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ.—Ὦ ῥιψοκίνδυνοι ἄνθρωποι! ποίημα ὁ πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, ὁ ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου γεννηθείς (Ps. cix. 3), ὁ εἰπὼν ὡς σοφία (Prov. viii. 26)· πρὸ δὲ πάντων βουνῶν γεννᾷ με; καὶ πολλάχου δὲ τῶν θείων λογίων γεγεννῆσθαι, ἀλλ' οὐ γεγονέναι τὸν υἱὸν λεγόμενον εὕροι τις ἄν. We should therefore believe εἰς Θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, καὶ εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα· ἡνῶσθαι δὲ τῷ Θεῷ τῶν ὅλων τὸν λόγον· ἐγὼ γάρ, φησι, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἓν ἐσμεν (Joh. x. 30)· καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί. Οὕτω γὰρ ἂν καὶ ἡ θεία τριὰς, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον κήρυγμα τῆς μοναρχίας διασώζοιτο. Comp. Martini l. c. S. 277 ff. Baur's Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit i. 311.

[1] There are certainly found, even in the older fathers, strong passages, to the effect that salvation is only to be found in the Catholic church. Even Origen hom. iii. in Josuam § 5, says: Nemo semetipsum decipiat: extra hanc domum, i.e. extra Ecclesiam nemo salvatur. Nam si quis foras exierit, mortis suae ipse fit reus. See Rothe die Anfänge der christl. Kirche i. 578. He expresses himself elsewhere, however, more mildly, just as Clement of Alexandria. See Rothe i. 624. Thus, while he does not allow to the virtuous heathen and the Jews vitam aeternam or regnum coelorum, which can be obtained only through faith in Christ, he yet asserts, Comm. in Ep. ad Rom. ii. 7: tamen gloria operum ejus et pax et honor poterit non perire. On the other hand Cyprianus de unitate ecclesiae: Quisquis ab ecclesia segregatus adulterae jungitur, a promissis ecclesiae separatur. Nec perveniet ad Christi praemia, qui relinquit ecclesiam Christi. Alienus est, profanus est, hostis est. Habere

outward expression in the unity of every thing belonging to the church. While religious faith was made interchangeable with the intelligent expression of it in doctrine, men began also to consider the unity of the latter as necessary to the unity of the church, and to limit freedom of inquiry more and more. How an endeavour was made to carry out an agreement in regard to ecclesiastical usages, with this very view, may be seen from Victor's conduct respecting the celebration of Easter in Asia (§ 59); and after his example, the constant effort to bring about uniformity, even in external usages, is obvious, particularly in the western church. The idea of this unity naturally led still farther to a closer external union among the separate churches; and since the bishops, as successors of the apostles, were looked upon as the centre of ecclesiastical unity, that connection was effected by their more intimate attachment to one another; and the episcopal dignity obtained not a little elevation in consequence. Another idea which exerted much influence on ecclesiastical life was this, that the constitution of the Christian church was a nobler copy of the Jewish temple-worship, and therefore, that the Mosaic laws relative to public worship, particularly the priesthood, were still valid in the church. (§ 53). No less fruitful in alterations in the worship of God was finally the idea of a *disciplina arcani*[2] which was current towards the conclusion of the second century. After the Christians had always been compelled to keep their worship private, through fear of persecution and profanation; they now began to find a reason for this mystery in the nature of their holy transactions, by virtue of which they must be kept secret as *mysteries* from all unbaptized persons (τελεταί Orig. c. Cels. III. p. 147),[3] an idea

jam non potest Deum patrem, qui ecclesiam non habet matrem. Si potuit evadere quisquam, qui extra arcam Noë fuit, et qui extra ecclesiam foris, fuerit, evadet.—Tales etiamsi occisi in confessione nominis fuerint, macula ista nec sanguine abluitur.—Esse martyr non potest, qui in ecclesia non est.—Occidi talis potest, coronari non potest, &c. H. E. Schmieder on Cyprian's treatise respecting the unity of the church in Stäudlin's and Tzschirner's Archiv f. Kirchengesch. v. ii. 417. Rettberg's Cyprianus S. 297, 348, 355. Rothe i. 635. Cyprian's Lehre v. d. Kirche von J. G. Huther. Hamb. u. Gotha 1839. 8.

[2] This appellation of the Christian mysteries is new, and appears to have been first used by G. Th. Meier de recondita veteris ecclesiae theologia. Helmst. 1679. 4.

[3] Tertull. de praescr. haeret. c. 41: Non omittam ipsius etiam conversationis haereticae descriptionem, quam futilis, quam terrena, quam hu-

which arose out of, and was fostered by the preference for mysteries exhibited at this period, and the example of the heathen mysteries. (see § 37). The so-called *apostolic constitutions*[4] may

mana sit, sine gravitate, sine auctoritate, sine disciplina, ut fidei suae congruens. In primis, quis catechumenus quis fidelis, incertum est: pariter adeunt, pariter orant, etiam ethnici, si supervenerint: sanctum canibus, et porcis margaritas, licet non veras jactabunt. cf. Apologet. c. 7. But this secrecy was still limited to the non-admission of the unbaptized to holy ordinances. The fathers of the 3d century speak without reserve as yet of these transactions, as of all the doctrines of Christianity, and Tertullian even reproaches the Valentinians in the following language, adv. Val. 1: nihil magis curant quam occultare, quod praedicant. It was not till the fourth century when this mysterious tendency became general, that even the positive doctrines of christianity began to be treated as mysteries. Catholic writers have been inclined to explain the non-appearance of their peculiar institutions and dogmas in antiquity by the aid of this disciplina arcani. This is done particularly by Em. a Schelstrate de disciplina arcani. Rom. 1685. 4. Of late works see Th. Lienhart de antiquis liturgiis et de discipl. arcani. Argentor. 1829. J. A. Toklot de arcani disciplina, quae antiqua in Ecclesia fuit in usu. Colon. 1836, 8. Comp. on the other side G. E. Tentzel diss. de disciplina arcani in his Exercitt. select. Lips. 1692, 4. G. C. L. Th. Frommann de disciplina arcani, quae in vetere Ecclesia christ. obtinuisse fertur. Jenae 1833. 8. R. Rothe de disciplinae arcani, quae dicitur, in Eccl. christ. origine. Heidelberg. 1841. 4.—Besides this disciplina arcani excluded only the unbaptized, and is therefore of a different nature from that disciplina agreeably to which Clement of Alexandria and Origen wished to withhold their gnosis even from Christians. (§ 63, not. 4 ff).

[4] The apostolic constitutions and canons (the best edition of them is in Cotelerii Patr. apostolicis vol. i.) are records of the ecclesiastical customs regarded as apostolic, in the form of apostolic prescriptions (cf. Hieron. epist. 52 ad Lucinium: Unaquaeque provincia abundet in sensu suo, et praecepta majorum leges apostolicas arbitretur. Augustin. contra Donatist. iv. 24: quod universa tenet Ecclesia, nec Conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum est, id nonnisi apostolica auctoritate traditum certissime credatur). The apostolic constitutions, διατάξεις τῶν Ἀποστόλων, consist of eight books, and probably belong to Syria. The first six books, presenting an account embracing the entire range of christian life, were written towards the end of the third century, and are probably the books which Eusebius h. e. iii. c. 25, quoted as διδαχαὶ τῶν Ἀποστόλων, Athanasius in ep. festali and in Synopsi sacrae Script. as διδαχὴ τ. Ἀ. The seventh book is an independent shorter manual of the same kind. Hence it generally treats of the same subjects as the first six books, and probably belongs to the beginning of the fourth century. The eighth book refers solely to the holy transactions (τὰ μυστικά), contains agenda in addition to the appropriate canonical prescriptions, and was put together in the middle of the fourth century as a pontifical book for the use of the clergy. This book had the title διατάξεις, which,

be considered, after deducting later interpolations, as an evidence of the constitution of the church at the present time, *The apostolic canons* belong to the fifth and sixth centuries.[5]

§ 68.

HISTORY OF THE HIERARCHY.

After the number of the Christians had greatly increased in

after the work had been soon after put along with the other books, was transferred to the whole. Epiphanius often quotes it as διατάξεις or διάταξις τῶν Ἀποστόλων. After Epiphanius there must, however, have been some interpolations, the most important of which are those by which the prescriptions respecting the festival of Christ's birth (v. 13), and the Easter festival (v. 17, cf. Epiphan. haer. xxx. 10), have been altered agreeably to the later form of observance. Krabbe assumes that after Epiphanius many interpolations were made, even doctrinal ones, favourable to the Arians and Macedonians, and that the eighth book was first appended after the time of that father; but in opposition to his opinion see Drey p. 154, 177. Comp. Dr O. Krabbe über den Ursprung u. den. Inhalt d. apost. Constitutionen des Clemens Romanus. Hamburg 1829. especially Dr J. S. v. Drey's neue Untersuchungen über die Constitutionen und Kanones d. Apostl. Tübingen 1832. 8.—According to Baur (über den Ursprung des Episcopats. S. 125 ff. 131 ff), the constitutions are of Ebionitish origin and antipauline tendency, and originated in Rome (p. 134).

[5] Canones Apostolorum, κανόνες ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ τῶν ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων among the Greeks 85, among the Latins 50. Every ecclesiastical fundamental law, whether recorded or not, was at first called κανὼν ἀποστολικός (Alexander Ep. Alex. about 318 in Theodoret. h. e, i. 3), κανών (Conc. Nicaeni Can. 5, 9), κανὼν ἐκκλησιαστικός (ibid. Can. 2, 10): in this sense the expression οἱ ἀποστολικοὶ κανόνες was also used at the Council of Constantinople ann. 394, without however supposing that our present collection is meant. (Drey p. 396). The first fifty canons were gathered soon after the middle of the fifth century, under the name of Clement, (who, known as the organ of the apostles, by means of the Clementines and Recognitions, (§ 58) appeared the most suitable person for this purpose), from the apostolic constitutions, and from the canons of several synods of the fourth century, (in particular the Synod of Antioch 341). Dionysius Exiguus translated them, and the Latin church holds fast by them alone. But after the commencement of the sixth century, 35 were added among the Greeks, the canons were appended to the constitutions, and the name of Clement transferred to these also. Drey p. 203 ff. M. E. Regenbrecht de canonibus Apostolorum et codice Ecclesiae Hispanae diss. Vratislav. 1828. 8. O. Krabbe diss. de codice Canonum qui Apostolorum nomine circumferuntur. Gotting. 1829. 4.

the country, separate churches in the country were now frequently formed, which attached themselves either to the district (παροικία) of the nearest town-bishop, and received from him a presbyter or deacon;[1] or chose their own bishops (χωρεπίσκοποι) who, however, soon came, in part, to be in a certain state of dependence on the nearest town-bishop.[2] The power of the bishops was enlarged, not only by this enlargement of their district, but also by an institution which now arose, in consequence of which the bishops came into a closer and more regular union among themselves. We allude to *Provincial Synods*, which were always becoming more frequent since the end of the second century, and were held in several provinces once or twice in the year. As they were for the most part convened in the principal city of the province, under the presidency of the bishop of that city; and since the latter was, as it were, the middle term in relation to the other smaller bishops, by whom alone they stood in connec-

[1] Thus mention is made by Dionys. Alex. ap. Euseb. h. e. vii. 24, 4, of πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διδασκάλους τῶν ἐν ταῖς κώμαις ἀδελφῶν; by the Conc. Illiberitanum ann. 305, can. 77, of Diaconum regentem plebem sine Episcopo et Presbytero; Conc. Neocaesar. ann. 315, can. 13, of ἐπιχωρίους πρεσβυτέρους.

[2] Thus they are called in the Epist. Syn. Antioch. ann. 270, apud Euseb. h. e. vii. 30, 6, ἐπισκόπους τῶν ὁμόρων ἀγρῶν. In the Conc. Ancyranum ann. 315. can. 13: Χωρεπισκόποις μὴ ἐξεῖναι, πρεσβυτέρους ἢ διακόνους χειροτονεῖν. cf. Bingham i. p. 192 ss. Planck's Gesellschaftsverf. i. S. 73 ff. In Africa, where the country bishops were particularly numerous, they were not at all distinguished from others, not even by a peculiar name. cf. St. A. Morcelli Africa christiana (Partes iii. Brixiae. 1816. 4). P. I. p. 43.

[3] Firmiliani epist. ad Cyprian. (in epist. Cyprian. 75): Qua ex causa necessario apud nos fit, ut per singulos annos seniores et praepositi in unum conveniamus ad disponenda ea, quae curae nostrae commissa sunt, ut si qua graviora sunt communi consilio dirigantur. What had hitherto been usual only in some provinces, was made a universal regulation by the Council of Nice, Can. 5: καλῶς ἔχειν ἔδοξεν, ἑκάστου ἐνιαυτοῦ καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν δὶς τοῦ ἔτους συνόδους γίνεσθαι. On the origin of Synods see above § 53, not. 6. The regular provincial Synods had, in most of the provinces, their natural type in the Κοινόν, Commune, i. e. the union of the civitates of the province which met from time to time, by deputies, in the metropolis, and gave advice in common matters. So we find frequently on coins Κοινὸν Ἀσίας, Κ. Βιθυνίας, &c. see Eckhel doctrina numorum vett. T. iv. p. 428 ss. Such assemblies were also called concilium, provinciale concilium, see Cod. Theodos. lib. xii. Tit. 12. and Gothofredi paratitlon prefixed to this title. Dirksen's civilistische Abhandl. Bd. 2, S. 16. And vice versa the ecclesiastical provincial synod is called Can. Nic. 5, τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἐπισκόπων.

tion with the rest of the church, the bishops of the principal cities (Μητροπολίτης, Metropolitanus)[4] came gradually to obtain a kind of superintendence over the other bishops of their province (ἐπαρχία). As yet, however, this metropolitan constitution was general only in *the east*. In *the west*, it is true, *Rome* was elevated to be the ecclesiastical metropolis of a great part of Italy; and even in Africa a somewhat similar, though peculiar, diocesan regulation had been adopted;[5] but in the remaining parts of the west, the Christians had not yet reached such hierarchical associations, on account of the small number of Christian churches.[6]

By this establishment of large ecclesiastical bodies, the entire organisation of the church became more compact and united.

[4] The principle which gradually arose by custom was afterwards expressed in the Conc. Antiocheni (341) can. 9: *τοὺς καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἐπισκόπους εἰδέναι χρὴ, τὸν ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει προεστῶτα ἐπίσκοπον καὶ τὴν φροντίδα ἀναδέχεσθαι πάσης τῆς ἐπαρχίας, διὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει πανταχόθεν συντρέχειν πάντας τοὺς πράγματα ἔχοντας. Ὅθεν ἔδοξε καὶ τῇ τιμῇ προηγεῖσθαι αὐτὸν, μηδὲν τε πρᾶττειν περιττὸν τοὺς λοιποὺς ἐπισκόπους ἄνευ αὐτοῦ, κατὰ τὸν ἀρχαῖον κρατήσαντα τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν κανόνα, ἃ ταῦτα μόνα ὅσα τῇ ἑκάστου ἐπιβάλλει παροικίᾳ, καὶ παῖς ὑπ' αὐτὴν χώραις· ἕκαστον γὰρ ἐπισκοπον ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ παροικίας, διοικεῖν τε κατὰ τὴν ἑκάστῳ ἐπιβάλλουσαν εὐλάβειαν, καὶ πρόνοιαν ποιεῖσθαι πάσης τῆς χώρας τῆς ὑπὸ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πόλιν, ὡς καὶ χειροτονεῖν πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους, καὶ μετὰ κρίσεως ἕκαστα διαλαμβάνειν· περαιτέρω δὲ μηδὲν πράττειν ἐπιχειρεῖν δίχα τοῦ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπισκόπου, μηδὲ αὐτον ἄνευ τῆς τῶν λοιπῶν γνώμης.* Bacchinii libb. iii. de origine hierarchiae ecclesiasticae. Mutinae 1704. 4. A history of the metropolitan constitution in W. C. S. Ziegler's pragmat. Geschichte der kirchl. Verfassungsformen in den ersten 6 Jahrh. der Kirche. Leipsig 1798, S. 61—164.

[5] Every African province had a primate at the head of it, who, in Mauretania and Numidia, was usually the oldest bishop, (not always the oldest, see Hüllmann's Ursprünge d. Kirchenverfassung des Mittelalters, Bonn, 1831, p. 101), (hence senex see Bingham vol. i. p. 214, Hüllmann p. 106), and in proconsular Africa was the bishop of Carthage. This last was at the same time the head of all the provinces, and could summon general councils. cf. Cypriani epist. 45: Latius fusa est nostra provincia: habet enim Numidiam et Mauretaniam sibi cohaerentes. Ziegler in Henke's Neuem Magazin i. 172 ff. Münteri primordia Eccl. Afr. p. 43 ss. This regulation was copied from the political one, because all these provinces were under the proconsul in Carthage, under whom the two Mauretanias were managed by procurators. See Mannert's Geographie d. Griechen u. Römer x. ii. 233, 391.

[6] Comp. the Ballerini observatt. ad Quesnelli diss. V. P. ii. in their edition of the Opp. Leonis tom. ii. p. 1030 ss. Ziegler's Gesch. der kirchl. Verfassungsformen S. 79 ff.

Through the medium of the metropolitans the testimonies and papers of the separate churches[7] were better attested and more safely forwarded; accounts of all important ecclesiastical events and resolutions were more expeditiously and generally circulated; and thus each community was always acquainted with the state of the whole church.

The bishops of the three great cities of the Roman empire, *Rome*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*, had at the same time the largest dioceses. Hence they were regarded as the principal bishops of Christendom; and their assent in all general affairs was looked upon as of special importance. Still, however, at this time, great stress was laid on the fact that all bishops were perfectly alike in dignity and power; and that each in his own diocese was answerable only to God for his conduct.[8] They

[7] Literae communicatoriae appear first in the Concil. Illiberit. can. 58, but their use is certainly much older. The *κανονικὰ γράμματα* (*ὡς κατὰ κανόνα γινόμενα* Zonaras ad Can. Laodic. 22), literae formatae (cf. formalis epistola. Sueton. in Domit. c. 13. cf. Beveregius ad can. Apost. 12), which served as testimonials for individuals, were partly *ἐπιστολαὶ συστατικαί*, partly *εἰρηνικαὶ* (literae pacis), partly *ἀπολυτικαί* (literae dimissoriae). There were besides *ἐπιστολαὶ κοινωνικαί* literae communicatoriae (afterwards *ἐνθρονιστικαί*), *ἐπιστολαὶ συνοδικαί*, *ἐγκύκλιοι* (1. circulares) etc. F. B. Ferrarii de antiquo epistolarum ecclesiasticarum genere libb. iii. Mediol. 1613, (ed. G. Th. Meier. Helmst. 1678. 4.) Ph. Priorii de literis canonicis diss. Paris 1675. 8. J. R. Kiesling de stabili primitivae ecclesiae ope literarum communicatoriarum connubio. Lips. 1745. 4.

[8] Cyprian. de unitate ecclesiae: Quam unitatem firmiter tenere et vindicare debemus, maxime episcopi, qui in ecclesiae praesidemus, ut Episcopatum quoque ipsum unum atque indivisum probemus.—Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur. Ej. epist. 52: episcopatus unus episcoporum multorum concordi numerositate diffusus. Ej. allocutio in Conc. Carthag. (in the year 256): Superest, ut de hac ipsa re, quid singuli sentiamus, proferamus, neminem judicantes, aut a jure communionis aliquem, si diversum senserit, amoventes. Neque enim quisquam nostrum episcopum se esse episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit, quando habeat omnis Episcopus pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suae arbitrium proprium, tanquam judicari ab alio non possit, cum nec ipse possit alterum judicare. Sed expectemus universi judicium domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui unus et solus habet potestatem et praeponendi nos in Ecclesiae suae gubernatione, et de actu nostro judicandi. Comp. his letters to two Roman bishops, ad Cornelium (Ep. 55, see below not. 11), ad Stephanum (Ep. 72): Caeterum scimus, quosdam quod semel imbiberint nolle deponere, nec propositum suum facile mutare, sed salvo inter collegas pacis et concordiae vinculo quaedam propria, quae apud se semel sint usurpata, retinere. Qua in re nec nos vim cuiquam facimus aut le-

could the less believe in the superior authority of the Romish bishop, because the idea of his being Peter's successor only began to be developed;[9] and besides, no higher power was attributed to Peter than to the other apostles.[10] In the west, indeed,

gem damus, quando habeat in Ecclesiae administratione voluntatis suae arbitrium liberum unusquisque praepositus, rationem actus sui Domino redditurus.

[9] The fiction of Peter being first bishop of Rome proceeded from the Clementines (§ 58, not. 9), and was propagated in the Catholic church by the Recognitions. Cyprian is the first who designates the Romish chair the locum Petri (Ep. 52 ad Antonianum) and Petri cathedram; but at the same time he takes all bishops to be successors of Peter (see note 10). Thus he was of the same opinion as Eusebius, Rufinus, and Epiphanius (§ 27, not. 6,) that Peter, during his stay at Rome, had the supreme direction of the church there, without having been connected with it as bishop. In Rome itself, however, many went farther, as may be seen from Firmiliani ep. ad Cyprianum (Ep. Cypr. 75): Stephanus, qui sic de Episcopatus sui loco gloriatur, et se successionem Petri tenere contendit.

[10] Comp. Clemens. Alex. above § 26, note 4. Origenes ad Matth. xvi. 18 (Comment. in Matth. T. xii. § 10): *πέτρα γὰρ πᾶς ὁ Χριστοῦ μαθητὴς—καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν τοιαύτην πέτραν οἰκοδομεῖται ὁ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς πᾶς λόγος, καὶ ἡ κατ' αὐτὸν πολιτεία.* § 11: *Εἰ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν ἕνα ἐκεῖνον Πέτρον νομίζεις ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκοδομεῖσθαι τὴν πᾶσιν ἐκκλησίαν μόνον, τί ἂν φήσαις περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ τῆς βροντῆς υἱοῦ, ἢ ἑκάστου τῶν Ἀποστόλων; Ἄλλως τε ἆρα τολμήσωμεν λέγειν, ὅτι Πέτρου μὲν ἰδίως πύλαι ᾅδου οὐ κατισχύσουσι τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν Ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν τελείων κατισχύσουσιν; ἆρα δὲ τῷ Πέτρῳ μόνῳ δίδονται ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου αἱ κλεῖδες τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἕτερος τῶν μακαρίων αὐτὰς λήψεται; Παρώνυμοι γὰρ πέτρας πάντες οἱ μιμηταὶ Χριστοῦ. Χριστοῦ μέλη ὄντες παρώνυμοι ἐχρημάτισαν Χριστιανοί, πέτρας δὲ Πέτροι. καὶ πρὸς πάντας τοὺς τοιούτους ἂν λέγοιτο ἀπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος τὸ λέγον· σὺ εἶ Πέτρος καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς.* Hence § 14: *λέλεκται τῷ Πέτρῳ καὶ παντὶ Πέτρῳ.* Cyprian, ep. 27: Dominus noster—episcopi honorem et ecclesiae suae rationem disponens in evangelio loquitur et dicit Petro: Ego tibi dico, quia tu es Petrus, &c. (Matth. xvi. 18, 19)—Inde per temporum et successionum vices episcoporum ordinatio et ecclesiae ratio decurrit, ut ecclesia super episcopos constituatur, et omnis actus ecclesiae per eosdem praepositos gubernetur:—Cyprian. de unitate ecclesiae: Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum: "Ego tibi dico," inquit, "quia tu es Petrus," &c. (Matth. xvi. 18, 19). [Et iterum eidem post resurrectionem suam dicit: "Pasce oves meas" (Joan. xxi. 15). Super illum unum aedificat ecclesiam suam, et illi pascendas mandat oves suas]: et quamvis Apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat et dicat: "sicut misit me pater," &c. (Joh. 20, 21, 23): tamen ut unitatem manifestaret [unam cathedram constituit, et] unitatis ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utique et caeteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio praediti et honoris et potestatis: sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, [et primatus Petro datur, ut una Christi ecclesia et cathedra una monstretur. Et pastores

a certain superior respect was paid to the Church of Rome as the largest and only apostolic church; but actual rights over the other churches were by no means conceded to it.[11] Still less, of course, was this the case in the east.[12]

sunt omnes, et grex unus ostenditur, qui ab Apostolis omnibus unanimi consensione pascatur,] ut ecclesia Christi una monstretur.—Hanc ecclesiae unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidem credit? Qui ecclesiae renititur et resistit, [qui cathedram Petri, super quem fundata est ecclesia, deserit,] in ecclesia se esse confidit? The passages in brackets are wanting in the oldest MSS., and are Romish interpolations. See especially Rigaltii observatt. ad Cyp. p. 162 sq. and Baluzii notae 11—15 to the lib. de unit. eccl. (which last, however, have been very much abridged by the Benedictine editors). Even the words still admitted by Rigaltius: super illum unum aedificat ecclesiam are wanting in the oldest MSS. cf. Edm. Richerii defensio lib. de eccles. et polit. potestate i. p. 115. These additions have quite another sense in the mouth of Cyprian than the interpolators meant. For example, what is denoted by the expression in Cyprian, primatus Petro datur, is clear from his 71 epist.: Nam nec Petrus, quem primum Dominus elegit, et super quem aedificavit ecclesiam suam, cum secum Paulus de circumcisione postmodum disceptaret, vindicavit sibi aliquid insolenter aut arroganter assumsit, ut diceret, se primatum tenere, et obtemperari a novellis et posteris sibi potius oportere.

[11] Cypriani epist. 55, ad Cornelium Episc. Romanum, who had received the excommunicated Felicissimus as ambassador of the Carthaginian archbishop Fortunatus:—satis miratus sum, cum animadvertissem, te minis atque terroribus eorum, qui venerant, aliquantum esse commotum, cum te, secundum quod scripsisti, agressi essent, cum summa desperatione comminantes, quod si litteras quas attulerant non accepisses, publice eas recitarent, et multa turpia ac probrosa et ore suo digna proferrent. Quod si ita res est, frater carissime, ut nequissimorum timeatur audacia—actum est de episcopatus vigore etc. Quibus etiam satis non fuit ab evangelio recessisse—foris sibi extra ecclesiam et contra ecclesiam constituisse conventiculum perditae factionis—.Post ista adhuc insuper pseudoepiscopo sibi ab haereticis constituto navigare audent et ad Petri cathedram, atque ad ecclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est, a schismaticis et profanis litteras ferre, nec cogitare, eos esse Romanos, quorum fides Apostolo praedicante laudata est (Rom. i. 8), ad quos perfidia habere non possit accessum. Quae autem causa veniendi et pseudoepiscopum contra episcopos factum nuntiandi? Aut enim placet illis quod fecerunt: et in suo scelere perseverant: aut si displicet et recedunt, sciunt quo revertantur. Nam cum statutum sit ab omnibus nobis, et aequum sit pariter ac justum, ut uniuscujusque causa illic audiatur, ubi est crimen admissum; et singulis pastoribus portio gregis sit adscripta, quam regat unusquisque et gubernet, rationem sui actus Domino redditurus: oportet utique eos quibus praesumus non circumcursare, nec episcoporum concordiam cohaerentem sua subdola et fallaci temeritate collidere, sed agere illic causam suam, ubi et accusatores habere et testes sui criminis possint; nisi si paucis desperatis et perditis

As all bishops were supposed to be perfectly alike in dignity and power, so also they believed that they had the same general duties towards the whole church in addition to those peculiar duties they owed to their respective dioceses.[13] Accordingly they all asserted equally the right of interfering, in cases where other bishops had departed from the fundamental rules of the church, by admonitions, reprimands, and even ecclesiastical punishment.[14]

minor videtur esse auctoritas episcoporum in Africa constitutorum, qui jam de illis judicaverunt. Jam causa eorum cognita est, jam de eis dicta sententia est: nec censurae congruit sacerdotum mobilis atque inconstantis animi levitate reprehendi, cum Dominus doceat et dicat: Sit sermo vester, est est, non non (Matth. v. 37). Cyprian, in his letters, constantly calls the Roman bishops frater and collega. What gave the latter a predominance in the west is evident from Synodi Arelatensis (in the year 314) Epist. ii. ad Sylvestrum Papam: Placuit etiam ante scribi ad te, qui majores dioeceses tenes, et per te potissimum omnibus insinuari. Quid autem sit, quod senserimus, scripto nostrae mediocritatis subjunximus.

[12] Firmiliani ep. ad Cypr. (l. c.): Eos autem, qui Romae sunt, non ea in omnibus observare, quae sint ab origine tradita, et frustra Apostolorum auctoritatem praetendere, scire quis etiam inde potest, quod circa celebrandos dies Paschae et circa multa alia divinae rei sacramenta videat esse apud illos aliquas diversitates, nec observari illic omnia aequaliter, quae Hierosolymis observantur.

[13] See especially Cypriani epist. 67 below note 14.

[14] L. E. du Pin de antiqua ecclesiae disciplina dissertt. hist. Paris 1686. p. 141 ss. For example, the condemnation of Paul of Samosata (§ 60, cf. du Pin p. 154). Reprimand of Dionysius of Alexandria (§ 64, note 8, du Pin p. 152). With reference to Marcian, bishop of Arles, who had gone over to the Novatians, Cyprian. Ep. 67, ad Stephan. Ep. Rom. writes, Cui rei nostrum est consulere et subvenire, frater carissime. Quapropter facere te oportet plenissimas litteras ad coepiscopos nostros in Galliis constitutos, ne ultra Marcianum pervicacem—collegio nostro insultare patiantur, quod necdum videatur a nobis abstentus—. Dirigantur in provinciam et ad plebem Arelate consistentem a te litterae, quibus abstento Marciano alius in locum ejus substituatur, et grex Christi, qui in hodiernum ab illo dissipatus et vulneratus contemnitur, colligatur. Sufficiat multos illic ex fratribus nostris annis istis superioribus excessisse sine pace. Vel ceteris subveniatur qui supersunt. Iccirco enim, frater carissime, copiosum corpus est sacerdotum concordiae mutuae glutino atque unitatis vinculo copulatum, ut si quis ex collegio nostro haeresim facere et gregem Christi lacerare et vastare tentaverit, subveniant caeteri, et quasi pastores utiles et misericordes oves dominicas in gregem colligant. Quid enim si in mari portus aliquis munitionibus suis ruptis infestus et periculosus esse navibus coeperit, nonne navigantes ad alios proximos portus naves suas dirigunt, ubi sit tutus accessus et salutaris introitus et statio secura? Quod nunc esse apud nos debet, frater carissime, ut fratres nostros, qui jactati Marciani scopulis petunt ecclesiae

This common right was of course principally exercised by the most distinguished and powerful bishops.

§ 69.

(CONTINUATION.) HIERARCHY IN THE SEPARATE CHURCHES.

After the idea of the Mosaic priesthood had been adopted in the Christian church, the clergy, as was natural, elevated themselves far above the laity. A peculiar mystic influence was ascribed to the ancient consecration as *ordinatio* performed by them; and they now appeared in the character of persons appointed by God himself to be the medium of communication between Him and the Christian world.[1]

portus salutares, suscipiamus ad nos prompta et benigna humanitate. Nam etsi pastores multi sumus, unum tamen gregem pascimus, et oves universas, quas Christus sanguine suo et passione quaesivit, colligere et fovere debemus etc. In the matter of the Spanish bishops Basilides and Martial (in the year 256), Cyprian, called upon to interfere, declares the interposition of Stephanus, Bishop of Rome, in favour of those deposed bishops to be exceptionable, Epist. 68, ad clerum et plebes in Hispania consistentes: Nec rescindere ordinationem (Sabini) jure perfectam potest, quod Basilides post crimina sua detecta et conscientiam etiam propria confessione nudatam, Romam pergens, Stephanum collegam nostrum longe positum et gestae rei ac veritatis ignarum fefellit, ut exambiret reponi se injuste in episcopatum, de quo fuerat jure depositus. Etsi aliqui de collegis nostris exstiterint (namely, Stephanus), fratres dilectissimi, qui deificam disciplinam negligendam putant, et cum Basilide et Martiale temere communicant, conturbare fidem nostram res ista non debet etc. Cf. du Pin p. 150.

[1] Cypriani epist. 55: Nam cum scriptum sit: Qui dixerit fratri suo, fatue etc. (Matth. v. 22), quomodo possunt censuram Domini ultoris evadere, qui talia ingerunt, non solum fratribus, sed et sacerdotibus, quibus honor tantus de Dei dignatione conceditur, ut quisquis sacerdoti ejus et ad tempus hic judicanti non obtemperaret, statim necaretur. Neque enim aliunde haereses obortae sunt, aut nata sunt schismata, quam inde quod sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in ecclesia ad tempus sacerdos et ad tempus judex vice Christi cogitatur. Epist. 69, ad Florent. Pupianum: Animadverto te—in mores nostros diligenter inquirere, et post Deum judicem, qui sacerdotes facit, te velle, non dicam de me (quantus enim ego sum?) sed de Dei et Christi judicio judicare. Hoc est in Deum non credere, hoc est rebellem adversus Christum et adversus evangelium ejus exsistere, ut—tu existimes, sacerdotes Dei sine conscientia ejus in ecclesia ordinari—.Quamobrem, frater, si majestatem Dei, qui sacerdotes ordinat, cogitaveris, si Christum, qui arbitrio et nutu

For the inferior services of the church particular offices were appointed, different, however, in the Greek and Latin churches. In the former, *ὑπηρέται* (or *ὑποδιάκονοι*), *ψαλτῳδοί* (or *ψάλται*), *ἀναγνώσται* and *πυλωροί*;[2] in the latter, Subdiaconi, Acoluthi, Exorcistae, Lectores, and Ostiarii,[3] (afterwards called ordines minores). All oppressed and helpless persons, especially widows, orphans, and virgins,[4] were referred to the clergy for assistance. The

ae praesentia sua et praepositos ipsos et ecclesiam cum praepositis gubernat, aliquando respexeris, si temeritatis—tuae agere vel sero poenitentiam coeperis, si Deo et Christo ejus—plenissime satisfeceris; communicationis tuae poterimus habere rationem: manente tamen apud nos divinae censurae respectu et metu, ut prius Dominum meum consulam, an tibi pacem dari, et te ad communicationem ecclesiae suae admitti sua ostensione et admonitione permittat. Memini enim, quid jam mihi sit ostensum, immo quid sit servo obsequenti et timenti de dominica et divina auctoritate praeceptum: qui inter caetera quae ostendere et revelare dignatus est, et hoc addidit: Itaque qui Christo non credit sacerdotem facienti, et postea credere incipiet sacerdotem vindicanti. Cf. Epistt. 45, 52, 65. On the dignity of the priests, and particularly of the bishops, see Const. Ap. ii. 26 ss. As spiritual fathers, they are to be regarded as higher than earthly parents, c. 33, higher than kings and princes, c. 34: *Τούτους ἄρχοντας ὑμῶν καὶ βασιλεῖς ἡγεῖσθαι νομίζετε, καὶ δασμοὺς ὡς βασιλεῦσι προσφέρετε. Ὅσῳ τοίνυν ψυχὴ σώματος κρείττων, τοσούτῳ ἱερωσύνη βασιλείας· δεσμεύει γὰρ αὐτὴ καὶ λύει τοὺς τιμωρίας ἢ ἀφέσεως ἀξίους· διὸ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον στέργειν ὀφείλετε ὡς πατέρα, φοβεῖσθαι ὡς βασιλέα, τιμᾷν ὡς κύριον.*

[2] So Constitutt. Apost. iii. 11, vi. 17. Those who are called in the first six books *ὑπηρέται* are denominated *ὑποδιάκονοι* in viii. 28 (*ὑπηρέται γάρ εἰσι διακόνων*): a *ὑποδιάκονος* is also named by Athanasius in epist. ad solitariam vitam agentes. Many communities, however, had different regulations. In the enumeration contained in Const. Apost. ii. 28, the *ὑπηρέται* are wanting, in the eighth book the *πυλωροί*. On the other hand, in viii. 11, the deacons have to watch the doors of the men, the subdeacons those of the women (cf. Conc. Laodic. in the fourth century, can. 22: *ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ὑπηρέτην τὰς θύρας ἐγκαταλιμπάνειν*). Thus the *ὑποδιάκονοι* and the *πυλωροί* were sometimes the same, sometimes different individuals. Respecting the readers and singers, see Socrates hist. eccl. v. 22: *ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἀναγνώσται καὶ ὑποβολεῖς ἀδιάφορον, εἴτε κατηχούμενοι εἰσίν, εἴτε πιστοί.* The Greek church never adopted Acoluthi and Exorcists, comp. Constitutt. Apost. viii. 26: *ἐπορκιστὴς οὐ χειροτονεῖται.* His gift is a free favour bestowed by God; and should he wish to assume the clerical office, he is ordained a bishop, presbyter, or deacon.

[3] First the Lectores mentioned in Tertullian de praescr. 41. The others are found first in Cyprian and in epist. Cornelii (bishop of Rome, 252) ap. Euseb. vi. 43, according to whose account there were in Rome 46 presbyters, 7 deacons, 7 subdeacons, 42 Acoluthi, and 42 Exorcists, Lectores, and Ostiarii.

[4] Const. Ap. ii. 26: *Αἵ τε χῆραι καὶ ὀρφανοὶ εἰς τύπον τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου*

bishop (*Papa*, Tert. de pudic. 13. Πάπα ἱερώτατος, Gregor. Thaum. epist. can. i. Praepositus, Cyprian note 1.) exercised this support, as well as the administration of the entire wealth of the church, by *the deacons*.[5] In like manner, supported by his clergy, he was umpire in all disputes between the members of his church.[6] The bishops greatly increased in reputation and revenues, both by the enlargement of their dioceses and the clergy subject to them, and by the operation of synods. But in this very way many were now led astray unto pride, ambition, and avarice;[7] sometimes even into an im-

λελογίσθωσαν ὑμῖν· αἵ τε παρθένοι εἰς τύπον τοῦ θυμιατηρίου τετιμήσθωσαν καὶ τοῦ θυμιάματος.

[5] Constitt. Apost. ii. 44: ἔστω ὁ Διάκονος τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου ἀκοή, καὶ ὀφθαλμὸς καὶ στόμα, καρδία τε καὶ ψυχή, ἵνα μὴ ᾖ τὰ πολλὰ μεριμνῶν ὁ Ἐπίσκοπος, ἀλλὰ μόνα τὰ κυριώτερα.

[6] As the Jews were accustomed to decide their disputes by umpires chosen from among the people, agreeably to the Mosaic law (Josephi antt. xiv. 10, 17, xvi. 6), so from the beginning the Christians also, according to 1 Cor. vi. 1 ff., were wont to establish the relations subsisting among them by the gospel, not by a heathen tribunal. The Roman jurisprudence favoured generally procedure by arbitration, ss Digest. lib. iv. tit. 8: De receptis, qui arbitrium receperunt, ut sententiam dicant. and in order to make the arbitration sentence secure, prescribed a penal clause to be inserted in the compromise. The Christians were accustomed to choose their bishops as umpires. Their decisions required no such safeguard, but were sufficiently protected by religious awe. Respecting this point, see Const. App. ii. 45—53. According to chapter 47, Monday is said to be the episcopal judicial day on which the bishop, surrounded by his presbyters and deacons, hears the contending parties, and also complaints regarding unchristian conduct. First of all, the other clergy attempt to reconcile the parties, and if this proves ineffectual, the episcopal sentence succeeds. But the bishop ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ σύμψηφον ἔχει καὶ συνίστορα τῆς δίκης τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ.

[7] Origenes in Exod. hom. xi. § 6: Quis autem hodie eorum, qui populis praesunt, non dico si jam aliqua ei a Deo revelata sunt, sed in legis scientia aliquid meriti habet, consilium dignatur inferioris saltem sacerdotis accipere? anedum dixerim laici vel gentilis. Idem in Matthaeum Tom. xvi. § 8 (on Luke xxii. 25, 26): Ἡμεῖς—τοιοῦτοί ἐσμεν, ὡς ἐνίοτε καὶ τὸν τῶν κακῶς ἀρχόντων ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὑπερβάλλειν τύφον, καὶ μονονουχὶ ζητεῖν ὡς οἱ βασιλεῖς ὁρυφόρους, καὶ φοβεροὺς ἑαυτοὺς καὶ δυσπροσίτους μάλιστα τοῖς πένησι κατασκευάζοντες, τοιοῦτοί ἐσμεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας ἡμῖν, καὶ περί τινων ἀξιοῦντας, ὡς οὐδὲ οἱ τύραννοι, καὶ ὠμότεροι τῶν ἀρχόντων πρὸς τοὺς ἱκέτας. Καί ἔστι γε ἰδεῖν ἐν πολλαῖς νομιζομέναις ἐκκλησίαις, καὶ μάλιστα ταῖς τῶν μειζόνων πόλεων, τοὺς ἡγουμένους τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ μηδεμίαν ἰσολογίαν ἐπιτρέποντας, ἔσθ' ὅτε καὶ τοῖς καλλίστοις τῶν Ἰησοῦ μαθητῶν, εἶναι πρὸς αὐτούς. καὶ ταῦτα πάντα μοι λέλεκται βουλομένῳ κατὰ τὸν λόγον παραστῆσαι, ὅτι οὐ μιμητέον τῷ ἄρχοντι τῆς ἐκκλησίας τὸν ἄρχοντα τῶν ἐθνῶν κ. τ. λ. Cf. ej. in Matth. commentariorum series § 9. Sicut autem super cathedram Moysi—sic et super cathedram ecclesiasticam se-

moderate ostentation.[8] Still, however, their power continued to be restricted in many ways. Although the provincial bishops exercised a decided influence on the choice of a bishop, yet the election depended in a great degree on the church.[9] The bishop himself, it is true, nominated the inferior clergy, but the presbyters had first to be approved by the church.[10] In the discharge

dent quidam dicentes, quae facere oporteat unumquemque, non autem facientes, et alligantes onera gravia et imponunt super humeros hominum, ipsi nec digito volentes ea movere (Matth. xxiii. 2, 3). Ibid. § 10, 12, 14, 61, in Num. hom. ii. 1, in Esaiam hom. vii. 3. Cyprian. de lapsis: Episcopi plurimi, quos et hortamento esse oportet caeteris et exemplo, divina procuratione contemta, procuratores rerum saecularium fieri; derelicta cathedra, plebe deserta, per alienas provincias oberrantes, negotiationis quaestuosae nundinas aucupari; esurientibus in ecclesia fratribus, habere argentum largiter velle, fundos insidiosis fraudibus rapere, usuris multiplicantibus fenus augere.

[8] Comp. the objections which were made to Paul of Samosata, in the writing of the synod at Antioch, which had been assembled against him, ap. Euseb. vii. 30. He drew from his episcopal jurisdiction unlawful gain, in the exercise of it initiated civil rulers, by causing to be erected for himself a *βῆμα καὶ θρόνον ὑψηλόν*, by having a *σήκρητον*, like worldly judges, and frequently giving himself up to the greatest violence. In the church he caused applause to be dealt out to him by the waving of handkerchiefs and clapping of hands. This was justly condemned; but since the clapping of hands, by way of applause, was universal in the fourth century, it may be assumed that Paul was not the only bishop of his time who willingly put up with it.

[9] Comp. § 30, note 12. Cyprian. epist. 68: plebs ipsa maxime habet potestatem vel eligendi dignos sacerdotes, vel indignos recusandi. Quod et ipsum videmus de divina auctoritate descendere, ut sacerdos plebe praesente sub omnium oculis deligatur, et dignus atque idoneus publico judicio ac testimonio comprobetur, sicut in Numeris Dominus Moysi praecepit dicens: Apprehende Aaron fratrem et Eleazarum filium ejus, et impone eos in montem coram omni synagoga etc. (Num. xx. 25). Coram omni synagoga jubet Deus constitui sacerdotem, id est, instruit et ostendit, ordinationes sacerdotales non nisi sub populi assistentis conscientia fieri oportere, ut plebe praesente vel detegantur malorum crimina vel bonorum merita praedicentur, et sit ordinatio justa et legitima, quae omnium suffragio et judicio fuerit examinata. Propter quod diligenter de traditione divina et apostolica observatione servandum est et tenendum, quod apud nos quoque et fere per provincias universas tenetur, ut ad ordinationes rite celebrandas ad eam plebem, cui praepositus ordinatur, episcopi ejusdem provinciae proximi quique conveniant, et episcopus deligatur plebe praesente, quae singulorum vitam plenissime novit, et uniuscujusque actum de ejus conversatione perspexit. Origenes in Levit. hom. vi. c. 3. Hence in Cyprian: Episcopus factus de Dei et Christi ejus judicio, de Clericorum testimonio, de Plebis suffragio (epist. 52, cf. ep. 41), cf. Lamprid. in Sev. Alex. c. 45 (§ 56, note 6). F. A. Staudenmaier's Gesch. der Bischofswahlen. Tübingen 1830. S. 20.

of his duties the bishop had not only to consult his presbyters,[11] but even in certain cases to ask the opinion of the whole church.[12] There were even cases in which laymen learned in the Scriptures publicly taught in the church with permission of the bishops.[13]

[10] Cyprian. ep. 65. Diaconi ab episcopis fiunt. Ep. 33, ad Clerum et plebem Carthag. In ordinationibus clericis, fratres carissimi, solemus vos ante consulere, et mores ac merita singulorum communi consilio ponderare. Cornelii ep. ad Fabium (ap. Euseb. vi. 43, 7): At the ordination of Novatian as presbyter ὁ ἐπίσκοπος διακωλυόμενος ὑπὸ παντὸς τοῦ κλήρου, ἀλλὰ καὶ λαϊκῶν πολλῶν,—ἠξίωσε συγχωρηθῆναι αὐτῷ τοῦτον μόνον χειροτονῆσαι. cf. Vales. ad h. l.

[11] In Cyprian often, consulere presbyterium, consilio communi res tractare, &c. Comp. Conc. Carthagin. gener. iv. v. J. 398, can. 23 (Mansi iii. p. 953): Episcopus nullus causam audiat absque praesentia clericorum suorum: aliequin irrita erit sententia Episcopi, nisi clericorum sententia confirmetur. Concerning the right of voting at synods see Ziegler in Henke's Neuem Magazin Bd. 1. S. 165 ff.

[12] Cyprian. ep. 5, ad Presbyt. et Diac.: quando a primordio episcopatus mei statuerim, nihil sine consilio vestro et sine consensu plebis mea privatim sententia gerere. So particularly at the readmittance of the lapsed. Cypriani ep. 11, ad plebem: Exspectent (lapsi) regressionem nostram, ut—convocati episcopi plures secundum Domini disciplinam, et Confessorum praesentiam, et vestram quoque sententiam beatorum martyrum litteras et desideria examinare possimus. Ep. 13, ad Clerum: Hoc enim et verecundiae et disciplinae et vitae ipsi omnium nostrum convenit, ut praepositi cum clero convenientes, praesente etiam stantium plebe, quibus et ipsis pro fide et timore suo honor habendus est, disponere omnia consilii communis religione possimus. Ep. 17, ad Presbyt. et Diac. Quae res cum omnium nostrum consilium et sententiam exspectet, praejudicare ego et soli mihi rem communem vindicare non audeo. Ep. 28, ad eosdem: Cui rei non potui me solum judicem dare, cum—haec singulorum tractanda sit et limanda plenius ratio, non tantum cum collegis meis, sed et cum plebe ipsa universa. That the same principles were acted on at Rome is clear from Ep. Cleri Rom. ad Cypr. (Ep. Cypr. 31).—Cypriani ep. 9, ad Clerum: Presbyters who have admitted the lapsed to church communion must agere et apud nos, et apud confessores ipsos, et apud plebem universam causam suam. cf. du Pin de ant. eccl. disc. p. 246 ss. J. H. Boehmeri xii. dissertt. juris eccl. ant. ed. ii. p. 149 ss.

[13] Epist. Alexandri Episc. Hierosol. et Theoctisti Caesariensis ad Demetrium Alexandr. (ap. Euseb. vi. 19, 7). In the case of Origen: Ἱεροσόληκας δὲ τοῖς γράμμασιν, ὅτι τοῦτο οὐδέ ποτε ἠκούσθη, οὐδὲ νῦν γεγένηται, τὸ, παρόντων ἐπισκόπων λαϊκοὺς ὁμιλεῖν, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως προφανῶς οὐκ ἀληθῆ λέγων, Ὅπου γοῦν εὑρίσκονται οἱ ἐπιτήδειοι πρὸς τὸ ὠφελεῖν τοὺς ἀδελφούς, καὶ παρακαλοῦνται τῷ λαῷ προσομιλεῖν ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων ἐπισκόπων· ὥσπερ ἐν Λαράνδοις Εὔελπις ὑπὸ Νέωνος, καὶ ἐν Ἰκονίῳ Παυλῖνος ὑπὸ Κέλσου, καὶ ἐν Συννάδοις Θεόδωρος ὑπὸ Ἀττικοῦ τῶν μακαρίων ἀδελφῶν· εἰκὸς δὲ καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις τόποις τοῦτο γίνεσθαι, ἡμᾶς δὲ μὴ εἰδέναι. So also Constitt. Apost. viii. c. 32: ὁ διδάσκων, εἰ καὶ λαϊκὸς ᾖ, ἔμπειρος δὲ τοῦ λόγου, καὶ τὸν τρόπον σεμνὸς,

§ 70.

DIVINE SERVICE.

In the third century the traces of buildings devoted exclusively to Christian worship became more frequent and obvious;[1] and as early as the peaceful times between the Valerian and Diocletian persecutions, splendid edifices had been erected for this purpose.[2] These were called προσευκτήριον, κυριακόν, dominicum, οἶκος ἐκκλησίας and simply ἐκκλησία. From the time of Constantine they were also styled ναός, templum, but never fanum and delubrum. In imitation of the temple of Jerusalem, a part of the interior was inaccessible to the people (ἁγίασμα, βῆμα, chorus), where the wooden table for the Lord's Supper (τράπεζα, mensa sacra) stood beside the seats of the clergy (καθέδρα, θρόνοι).[3] Though the Christians were fond of certain religious symbols on many of their household utensils,[4] yet nothing of this kind was allowed in the churches.[5]

At the time of Origen, the Christians had no other general festivals besides Sunday, than the parasceve, (preparation) the

διδασκέτω· ἔσονται γὰρ πάντες διδακτοὶ θεοῦ (Jo. vi. 45): and Conc. Carthag. gener. iv. c. 98 (Mansi iii. p. 959): Laicus praesentibus clericis nisi ipsis jubentibus docere non audeat.

[1] Under Severus Alexander (§ 56, note 6) then in Cyprian, Dionysius of Alexandria, &c. Comp. above § 53, note 10.

[2] Euseb. h. e. viii. 1, 2: μηδαμῶς ἔτι τοῖς παλαιοῖς οἰκοδομήμασιν ἀρχόμενοι, εὐρείας εἰς πλάτος ἀνὰ πάσας τὰς πόλεις ἐκ θεμελίων ἀνίστων ἐκκλησίας.

[3] A prescription respecting the planning of churches is found in Constitt. Apost. ii. 57. A description of the church at Tyre apud Euseb. x. 4, 15 ss.

[4] So on the rings of seals a dove, a ship, a lyre, an anchor, a fish, &c. Clem. Alex. paedag. iii. p. 289. Tertullianus de pudic. c. 7 mentions the picturae calicum representing the ovis perdita a Domino requisita, et humeris ejus revecta, but does not seem (cap. 10) to approve of it. Münter's Sinnbilder de alten Christen. Heft 1. S. 7 f.

[5] Can. Illiberit. 36: Placuit, picturas in ecclesia esse non debere, ne quod colitur et adoratur, in parietibus depingatur. The older catholic theologians, for example Baronius, Bellarmine, Perronius, &c., tried many ways of evading the force of this canon; on the contrary, the true meaning of it, with its historical consequences, has been acknowledged by Petavius dogm. theol. lib. xv. c. 13. no. 3. Pagius crit. ad ann. 55 no. 4. 18. especially Natalis Alexander ad hist. eccl. saec. iii. Diss. 21. Art. 2.

passover, and the feast of *pentecost*.[6] Soon after, however, there appears to have been added to them the feast of *the ascension* (ἡ ἑορτὴ τῆς ἀναλήψεως τοῦ Κυρίου).[7] So also in Egypt, towards the end of the third century, they began to observe, after the example of Basilides' followers,[8] the *epiphany* (τὰ ἐπιφάνια) on the sixth of January, but according to the orthodox view of the appearance of the Logos on earth, (ἡ ἐπιφάνεια), not simply as the festival of his baptism, but also as that of his birth. The arrangement of Divine worship at this time is found in the Constitt. Apost. ii. 57. At the agapae, the clergy and poor were particularly remembered. (l. c. ii. 28.)

The respect paid to martyrs still maintains the same character as in the second century, differing only in degree, not in kind, from the honour shown to other esteemed dead. As the churches held the yearly festivals of their martyrs at the graves of the latter,[9] so they willingly assembled frequently in the burial places of their deceased friends,[10] for which they used in many places even caves (cryptae, catacumbae).[11] At the cele-

[6] Origen. contra Cels. viii. p. 392.

[7] First mentioned in the Constitt. Apostol. v. 19, and considered by Augustine (ep. 118 ad Januar.) as an ancient festival. See Krabbe über die apost. Constitutionen. S. 176 ff.

[8] Comp. § 45, note 2. So also Jablonski de orig. festi nativ. Christi diss. i. § 7. (Opusc. ed. te Water iii. p. 328 ss.) Differently Neander gnost. Systeme S. 49. 81. and Kirchengesch. i. i. S. 519. On the other side see Hallische A. L. Z. April 1823. S. 836.

[9] Comp. § 53, note 46. A remarkable accommodation of Gregory Thaumaturgus, see Vita S. Gregorii Thaumat. per Gregor. Nyssenum (ed. G. Vossii p. 312): Συνιδὼν ὅτι ταῖς σωματικαῖς θυμηδίαις τῇ περὶ τὰ εἴδωλα πλάνῃ παραμένει τὸ νηπιῶδες τῶν πολλῶν καὶ ἀπαίδευτον· ὡς ἂν τὸ προηγούμενον τέως ἐν αὐτοῖς μάλιστα κατορθωθείη τὸ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀντὶ τῶν ματαίων σεβασμάτων βλέπειν, ἐφῆκεν αὐτοῖς ταῖς τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων ἐμφαιδρύνεσθαι μνήμαις καὶ εὐπαθεῖν καὶ ἀγάλλεσθαι·

[10] Constitt. Apost. v. c. 8: συναθροίζεσθε ἐν τοῖς κοιμητηρίοις, τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν τῶν ἱερῶν βιβλίων ποιούμενοι, καὶ ψάλλοντες ὑπὲρ τῶν κεκοιμημένων μαρτύρων καὶ πάντων τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος ἁγίων, καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν τῶν ἐν κυρίῳ κεκοιμημένων· καὶ τὴν ἀντίτυπον τοῦ βασιλείου σώματος Χριστοῦ δεκτὴν εὐχαριστίαν προσφέρετε ἔν τε ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐν τοῖς κοιμητηρίοις. Hence Aemilianus, governor of Egypt, said to the Christians brought before him in the Decian persecution (Dionys. Alex. ap. Euseb. vii. 11, 4): οὐδαμῶς δὲ ἐξέσται ὑμῖν—ἢ συνόδους ποιεῖσθαι, ἢ εἰς τὰ καλούμενα κοιμητήρια εἰσιέναι. So also the proconsul of Africa (Acta proconsularia S. Cypriani c. 1). Gallienus removed this prohibitory rule (see above § 56, note 14); but Maximinus afterwards renewed it (Euseb. ix. c. 2).

[11] Christian catacombs are found in Rome, Naples, Syracuse, and Malta. In the year 1844 they were also discovered on the island Melos.

bration of the Lord's supper, both the living who brought oblations, as well as the dead, and the martyrs for whom offerings were presented, especially on the anniversary of their death, were included by name in the prayer of the church.[12] Inasmuch as the re-admission of a sinner into the church was thought to stand in close connexion with the forgiveness of sin, an opinion was associated with the older custom of restoring to church communion the lapsed who had been again received by the martyrs, that the martyrs could also be serviceable in obtaining the forgiveness of sins.[13] In doing so they set out in

Respecting the Roman catacombs Hieronymus in Ezechiel. c. 40: Dum essem Romae puer, et liberalibus studiis erudirer, solebam cum caeteris ejusdem aetatis et propositi diebus dominicis sepulchra Apostolorum et Martyrum circuire: crebroque cryptas ingredi, quae in terrarum profunda defossae, ex utraque parte ingredientium per parietes habent corpora sepulturarum, et ita obscura sunt omnia, ut propemodum illud propheticum compleatur: descendant ad infernum viventes, &c. cf. Prudentius περὶ στεφ. hymn. xi. Passio Hippolyti v. 153 ss.—Modern descriptions of the catacombs in Rome, Pauli Aringhi Roma subterranea novissima. Paris 1659. 2 voll. fol. M. A. Boldetti osservazioni sopra i Cimiteri de' SS. Martiri, ed antichi Cristiani di Roma. 1720. 2 T. fol. See farther the works of Bottari, Ciampini, &c. (see Münter's Sinnbilder d. alten Christen. Heft. 1. S. 24). Volkmann's histor. krit. Nachrichten v. Italien. (Leipz. 3 Bde. 1777), iii. 67. A description of the city of Rome by Platner, Bunsen, Gerhard and Röstell (Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1830, i. 355): Respecting those in Naples: Pellicia de christ. eccl. politia. tom. iii. P. ii. Diss. 5. Chr. F. Bellermann über die ältesten christl. Begräbnisstätten, u. bes. die Katakomben zu Neapel mit ihren Wandgemälden, Hamburg 1839. 4: Respecting those in Sicily see Bartel's Briefe über Calabrien u. Sicilien. (Götting. 3 Th. 1787—91), iii. 203. Münter's Nachrichten v. Neapel und Sicilien S. 344.—Of the mass of relics and indulgences, the symbol of the palm and the pretended blood-vessels (which were more probably used in the celebration of the eucharist) have been established marks of the graves of martyrs; but that they are not sufficient marks is shown by Eusebius Romanus (Mabillon) de cultu Sanctorum ignotorum. Paris. 1688. 4. In the second edition, however, he was obliged to yield. 1705. [The church in the Catacombs, by Dr C. Maitland. London, 1846. 8vo).

[12] These registers of names, since they were not always the same, were inscribed for each occasion on the writing tables then used (diptycha, δίπτυχα), and afterwards erased. Hence the appellation diptycha was used of the lists of names of persons to be mentioned at the communion service, though these lists afterwards assumed a more permanent character after all the offerentes were no longer called by name. This, and the peculiar names diptycha Episcoporum, dipt. vivorum, dipt. mortuorum, first occur in the fifth century. Chr. A. Salig. de diptychis veterum tam profanis quam sacris. Halae 1731. 4.

[13] Against this notion great zeal is shown by Tertull. de pudicitia c.

part with the idea, which is very natural, that the dead prayed for the living, as the living prayed for the dead,[14] but that the intercession of martyrs abiding in the captivity of the Lord, would be of peculiar efficacy on behalf of their brethren:[15] while they partly thought that the martyrs, as assessors in the last decisive judgment, were particularly active, (1 Cor. vi. 2, 3.)[16] Origen attributed very great value to that intercession, in expecting from it great help towards sanctification;[17] but he went be-

22: in ipsa securitate et possessione martyrii quis permittit homini donare quae Deo reservanda sunt?—Sufficiat martyri propria delicta purgasse. Ingrati vel superbi est in alios quoque spargere, quod pro magno fuerit consecutus. On the other hand, even Cyprian, ep. 12 and 13, admits, Christianos auxilio Martyrum adjuvari apud Dominum in delictis suis posse.

[14] Cypriani epist. 57 ad Cornelium: Memores nostri invicem simus,—utrobique pro nobis semper oremus,—et si quis istinc nostrum prior divinae dignationis celeritate praecesserit, perseveret apud Dominum nostra dilectio, pro fratribus et sororibus nostris apud misericordiam patris non cesset oratio.

[15] Cyprian writes to confessors ep. 15: vox illa purificatione confessionis illustris—impetrat de Domini bonitate quod postulat; and ep. 77: nunc vobis in precibus efficacior sermo est, et ad impetrandum quod in pressuris petitur facilior oratio est.

[16] Cyprianus de lapsis: Credimus quidem posse apud judicem plurimum Martyrum merita et opera justorum: sed cum judicii dies venerit, cum post occasum saeculi hujus et mundi ante tribunal Christi populos ejus adsteterit. Martyrs are according to Dionysius Alex. ap. Euseb. h. e. vi. 42, 3: *οἱ νῦν τοῦ Χριστοῦ πάρεδροι καὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ κοινωνοί, καὶ μέτοχοι τῆς κρίσεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ συνδικάζοντες αὐτῷ.*

[17] Origenes in Cant. Cant. lib. iii. ed. de la Rue. T. iii. p. 75: Sed et omnes sancti, qui de hac vita decesserunt, habentes adhuc charitatem erga eos qui in hoc mundo sunt, si dicantur curam gerere salutis eorum, et juvare eos precibus suis atque interventu suo apud Deum, non erit inconveniens.—in libr. Jesu Nave hom. xvi. 5: Ego sic arbitror, quod omnes illi, qui dormierunt ante nos, patres pugnent nobiscum et adjuvent nos orationibus suis. Ita namque etiam quemdam de senioribus magistris audivi dicentem in eo loco, in quo scriptum est in Numeris (xxii. 4), quia ablinget synagoga illa hanc synagogam, sicut ablingit vitulus herbam viridem in campo. Dicebat ergo: Quare hujusmodi similitudo assumpta est, nisi quia hoc est, quod intelligendum est in hoc loco, quod synagoga Domini, quae nos praecessit in sanctis, ore et lingua consumit adversariam synagogam, i.e. orationibus et precibus adversarios nostros absumit?—in epist. ad Rom. lib. ii. 4: Jam vero si etiam extra corpus positi vel sancti, qui cum Christo sunt, agunt aliquid, et laborant pro nobis ad similitudinem Angelorum, qui salutis nostrae ministeria procurant: vel rursum peccatores etiam ipsi extra corpus positi agunt aliquid secundum propositum mentis suae, ad angelorum nihilominus similitudinem sinistrorum, cum quibus et in aeternum ignem mittendi dicuntur a

yond the ideas hitherto entertained in attributing to martyrdom an importance and efficacy similar to the death of Christ.[18] Hence, he feared the cessation of persecution as a misfortune.[19] The more the opinion that value belonged to the intercession of martyrs was established,[20] the oftener it may have happened that persons recommended themselves to the martyrs yet living for intercession.[21] On the other hand, no trace is found of invocation of the dead, since the idea was not yet entertained of the living being able to make known their requests to them.

§ 71.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

Memorials of the ecclesiastical discipline of this period exist in the Epistolae canonicae of Dionysius bishop of Alexandria, of Gregory Thaumaturgus (both

Christo: habeatur et hoc quoque inter occulta Dei, nec chartulae committenda mysteria.

[18] Origenis exhort. ad Martyr. c. 30: *ἐπίστησον, εἰ τὸ κατὰ τὸ μαρτύριον βάπτισμα, ὥσπερ τὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος καθάρσιον γέγονε τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ αὐτὸ ἐπὶ πολλῶν θεραπείᾳ καθαιρόμενον γίνεται. ὡς γὰρ οἱ τῷ κατὰ τὸν Μωσέως νόμον θυσιαστηρίῳ προσεδρεύοντες διακονεῖν ἐδόκουν δι' αἵματος ταυρῶν καὶ τράγων ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτημάτων ἐκείνοις, οὕτως αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν πεπελεκισμένων ἕνεκεν τῆς μαρτυρίας Ἰησοῦ μὴ μάτην τῷ ἐν οὐρανοῖς θυσιαστηρίῳ παρεδρεύουσαι διακονοῦσι τοῖς εὐχομένοις ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτημάτων.* cap. 50: *Τάχα δὲ καὶ ὥσπερ τιμίῳ αἵματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἠγοράσθημεν,—οὕτως τῷ τιμίῳ αἵματι τῶν μαρτύρων ἀγορασθήσονταί τινες.* cf. in Numeros Hom. xxiv. 1.

[19] Origenes in Num. hom. x. 2: Et quidem quod Dominus noster J. Chr. venerit, ut tolleret peccatum mundi, et morte sua peccata nostra deleverit, nullus, qui Christo credit, ignorat. Quomodo autem et filii ejus auferant peccata sanctorum, i.e. Apostoli et Martyres, si poterimus, ex scripturis divinis probare tentabimus. (He appeals to 2 Cor. xii. 15, 2 Tim. iv. 6, Apoc. vi. 9.) Unde ego vereor, ne forte, ex quo Martyres non fiunt, et hostiae sanctorum non offeruntur pro peccatis nostris, peccatorum nostrorum remissionem non mereamur. Et ideo etiam diabolus, sciens, per passionem Martyrii remissionem fieri peccatorum, non vult nobis publicas Gentilium persecutiones movere.

[20] The Origenist Eusebius refers on this point, Praep. evang. xii. c. 3, first to Plato de Legg. lib. xi., then: *καὶ ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ δὲ τῶν Μακκαβαίων* (2 Macc. xv. 14) *λέγεται Ἱερεμίας ὁ προφήτης μετὰ τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν τοῦ βίου εὐχόμενος ὀρᾶσθαι ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ, ὡς φροντίδα ποιούμενος τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἀνθρώπων. Δεῖ δέ φησι καὶ ὁ Πλάτων τούτοις πιστεύειν.*

[21] So Eusebius de Martyr. Palaest. cap. 7, relates that a maiden Theodosia in Caesarea was added to the martyrs expecting their death, *ὁμοῦ φιλοφρονουμένη, καὶ οἷα εἰκὸς ὑπὲρ τοῦ μνημονεύειν αὐτῆς πρὸς τὸν κύριον γενομένους παρακαλοῦσα.*

about 260), and Peter, bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 306; the canons of the councils of Illiberis (305 ?), Arelate (314), Ancyra (315), and Neo-Caesarea (315). All these are found in collections of the councils, and in Routh's Reliquiae Sacrae.

After the holiest transactions of public worship began to be treated as mysteries, the mode of admission to Christianity naturally assumed another form. A preparatory course preceded it, in which the catechumens (*κατηχούμενοι*) were instructed by suitable teachers (catechistes, doctor audientium)[1] and prepared for baptism through different classes (*ἀκροώμενοι*, audientes,—*γονυκλίνοντες*, genuflectentes,—*βαπτιζόμενοι, φωτιζόμενοι*, competentes).[2] The condition of catechumen usually continued several years; but the catechumens often deferred even baptism as long as possible on account of the remission of sins by which it was to be accompanied.[3] Hence it was often necessary to baptise the sick; and for them the rite of sprinkling was introduced (baptismus clinicorum, *τῶν κλινικῶν*).[4] The baptism of children was more common.[5] The exorcism of those about to

[1] At this time the positive doctrines had not yet been kept secret from the catechumens. See the rule respecting their instructions in Const. Apost. vii. 39.

[2] In Tertullian and Cyprian the audientes and Catechumeni are synonymous. In Origen contra Cels. iii. 481. ed. de la Rue, Boehmer christl. Kirchl. Alterthumswissenschaft ii. 287, and Rothe de disciplinae arcani origine p. 13 find three classes of catechumens. See on the other side C. F. W. Hasselbach de Catechumenorum ordinibus, quot fuerint in vetere Eccl. graeca et lat., 1839. and Redepenning's Origenes i. 358. The *γονυκλίνοντες* are first mentioned by Conc. Neocaesar. can. 5. Nicaen. can. 14. Tob. Pfanner de Catechumenis antiquae ecclesiae. Francof. et Goth. 1688. 12. Bingham antiquitt. lib. x. (vol. iv.).

[3] Disapproved Constit. Apost. vi. 15: *Ὁ δὲ λέγων, ὅτι ὅταν τελευτῶ, βαπτίζομαι, ἵνα μὴ ἁμαρτήσω καὶ ὑπανῶ τὸ βάπτισμα, οὗτος ἄγνοιαν ἔχει θεοῦ, καὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ φύσεως ἐπιλήσμων τυγχάνει.*

[4] cf. Cypriani ep. 76. ad Magnum, that the baptism of them ought not to be regarded as invalid, eo quod aqua salutari non loti sunt, sed perfusi.

[5] Comp. § 53. not. 20. Origen found the baptism of children already existing in his circle, and defended it. Walli hist. baptism. infant. P. i. p. 72 ss.—Fidus, an African bishop, believed, considerandam esse legem circumcisionis antiquae, ut intra octavum diem eum, qui natus est, baptizandum et sanctificandum non putaret. On the other hand, Cyprian with his provincial synod (epist. 64 ad Fidum), a baptismo atque a gratia Dei, qui omnibus et misericors, et benignus, et pius est, neminem per nos debere prohiberi. Wall. l. c. p. 94 ss.

be baptised is now distinctly mentioned;[6] and all baptised persons, even children, received the eucharist. When the congregations became larger, presbyters and deacons baptised in addition to the bishop. In the west, however, the baptised had to receive from the bishop the imposition of hands.[7] In the east the baptising presbyters performed this ceremony.[8]

As those who were excommunicated were universally supposed to be under the dominion of the devil,[9] as much as the unbaptised, they had to undergo, as poenitentes, a similar though more severe probation-period than the catechumens, before they could be again received (pacem dare, reconciliare).[10] The No-

[6] Comp. § 53, not. 24. Vincentius a Thibari (in Conc. Carth. in the year 256): Ergo primo per manos impositionem in exorcismo, secundo per baptismi regenerationem, tunc possunt ad Christi pollicitationem venire.

[7] Cyprianus ep. 73, ad Jubajanum: nunc quoque apud nos geritur, ut qui in Ecclesia baptizantur praepositis Ecclesiae offerantur, et per nostram orationem ac manus impositionem Spiritum sanctum consequantur, et signaculo dominico consummentur. Conc. Illiberit. can. 38, 67.

[8] Constit. Apost. vii. 43, 44.

[9] The expression παραδοῦναι τῷ Σατανᾷ 1 Cor. v. 5, 1 Tim. i. 20, referred to excommunication. Origines in lib. Judic. hom. ii. § 5, in Jerom. hom. xviii. § 14, Selecta in Jer. xxix. 4.

[10] In what relation this admission was supposed to stand to the forgiveness of sins may be seen from Firmiliani ep. ad Cypr. (Ep. Cypr. 75):—per singulos annos seniores et praepositi in unum convenimus,—ut si qua graviora sunt, communi consilio dirigantur, lapsis quoque fratribus et post lavacrum salutare a diabolo vulneratis per ponitentiam medela quaeratur: non quasi a nobis remissionem peccatorum consequantur, sed ut per nos ad intelligentiam delictorum suorum convertantur, et Domino plenius satisfacere cogantur. Cyprian. de lapsis: Nemo se fallat, nemo se decipiat. Solus Dominus misereri potest: veniam peccatis, quae in ipsum commissa sunt, solus potest ille largiri, qui peccata nostra portavit.—Homo Deo esse non potest major; nec remittere aut donare indulgentia sua servus potest, quod in Dominum delicto graviore commissum est.—Dominus orandus est, Dominus nostra satisfactione placandus est, qui negantem negare se dixit, qui omne judicium de patre solus accepit.—Confiteantur singuli, quaeso vos, fratres dilectissimi, delictum suum, dum adhuc qui deliquit in saeculo est, dum admitti confessio ejus potest, dum satisfactio et remissio facta per sacerdotes apud Dominum grata est.—Rogamus vos, ut pro vobis Deum rogare possimus. Preces ipsas ad vos prius vertimus, quibus Deum pro vobis, ut misereatur, oramus. (Later Leo I. about 450, Ep. 89: sic divinae bonitatis praesidia ordinata, ut indulgentia Dei nisi supplicationibus sacerdotum nequeat obtineri). Farther Cypriani ep. 52: pignus vitae in data pace percipiunt:—accepta pace commeatus a Deo datur. Comp. above § 67,

vatian disputes occasioned the orientals to appoint a πρεσβύτερος ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας in the separate churches;[11] and this seems to have had an influence in bringing it about that public penance, even at the end of the third century, had a succession of grades similar to the probation-period of the catechumens.[12] The four gradus or stationes poenitentiae were πρόσκλαυσις, ἀκρόασις, ὑπόπτωσις, σύστασις (προσκλαίοντες, χειμάζοντες, flentes, hiemantes,—ἀκροώμενοι, audientes—γονυκλίνοντες, ὑποπίπτοντες, genuflectentes, substrati—συνιστάμενοι, consistentes). Excommunication fell only on public, gross offences. Other sinners were referred to the admonition of the more experienced brethren.[13]

not. 1. The reconciliation was no actus ordinis, but jurisdictionis, and could therefore be transferred from the bishop himself to a deacon. Cypr. ep. 12, directs, ut qui libellos a martyribus acceperunt, et praerogativa eorum apud Deum adjuvari possunt (ep. 13, et auxilio eorum adjuvari apud Dominum in delictis suis possunt), si incommodo aliquo et infirmitatis periculo occupati fuerint, non exspectata praesentia nostra, apud presbyterum quemcunque praesentem, vel si presbyter repertus non fuerit, et urgere exitus coeperit, apud diaconum quoque exomologesin facere delicti sui possint: ut manu eis in poenitentiam imposita veniant ad Dominum cum pace, quam dari martyres litteris ad nos factis desideraverunt.

[11] Socrates v. c. 19: Ἀφ' οὗ Ναυατιανοὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας διεκρίθησαν,—οἱ Ἐπίσκοποι τῷ ἐκκλησιαστικῷ κανόνι τὸν Πρεσβύτερον τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας προσέθεσαν, ὅπως ἂν οἱ μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα πταίσαντες ἐπὶ τοῦ προβληθέντος τούτου πρεσβυτέρου ἐξομολογῶνται τὰ ἁμαρτήματα. cf. Sozomenus viii. c. 16.

[12] Cyprian knows nothing of these grades. He sets forth the arrangement to be pursued with the penitent epist. 11: Nam cum in minoribus delictis, quae non in Deum committuntur, poenitentia agatur justo tempore, et exomologesis fiat inspecta vita ejus qui agit poenitentiam, nec ad communicationem venire quis possit, nisi prius illi ab episcopo et clero manus fuerit imposita: quanto magis in his gravissimis et extremis delictis caute omnia—observari oportet: In like manner they are not found in the course prescribed for penitents in Const. Apost. ii. 16. The grades are first mentioned in (since Gregor. Thaumat. epist. canonica can. ii., as well as Morinus de poen. lib. vi. c. 1, § 9, has shown them to be spurious, and to have arisen from Basilii epist. 217, or canonica iii. c. 75, see Routh reliqu. sacr. ii. p. 458 ss.) Conc. Ancyr. c. 4. Conc. Nicaen. c. 11. J. Morinus de disciplina in administratione sacramenti poenitentiae. Paris 1651, fol. J. Dallaeus de sacramentali s. auriculari Latinorum confessione. Genev. 1661, 8. Sam. Basnagii Annales politico-eccles. T. ii. p. 475. Bingham lib. xviii. in vol. viii.

[13] Origenes in Psalm. xxxvii. hom. ii. § 6: Oportet peccatum non celare intrinsecus. Fortassis enim sicut ii, qui habent intus inclusam escam indigestam, aut humoris vel phlegmatis stomacho graviter et moleste immanentis abundantiam, si vomuerint, relevantur: ita etiam hi

The time of penance usually continued several years, sometimes even to the hour of death.[14] In Africa and Spain, re-admission was for ever forbidden in case of certain offences.[15] This strictness was relaxed only when martyrs interceded on behalf of the lapsed.[16] But during the Decian persecution, the martyrs in Africa abused this privilege granted them by custom, so much that Cyprian was obliged to oppose them.[17] Yet this

qui peccaverunt, si quidem occultant, et retinent intra se peccatum, intrinsecus urgentur et propemodum suffocantur a phlegmate vel humore peccati: si autem ipse sui accusator fiat, dum accusat semetipsum et confitetur, simul evomit et delictum, atque omnem morbi digerit causam. Tantummodo circumspice diligentius, cui debeas confiteri peccatum tuum. Proba prius medicum, cui debeas causam languoris exponere, qui sciat infirmari cum infirmante, flere cum flente, qui condolendi et compatiendi noverit disciplinam: ut ita demum, si quid ille dixerit, qui se prius et eruditum medicum ostenderit et misericordem, si quid consilii dederit, facias, et sequaris, si intellexerit et praeviderit, talem esse languorem tuum, qui in conventu totius Ecclesiae exponi debeat et curari, ex quo fortassis et ceteri aedificari poterunt, et tu ipse facile sanari: multa hoc deliberatione, et satis perito medici illius consilio procurandum est. Of course application was especially made to the clergy: hence Origenes in Levit. hom. ii. § 4: Est—per poenitentiam remissio peccatorum, cum lavat peccator in lacrymis stratum suum,—et cum non erubescit sacerdoti Domini indicare peccatum suum, et quaerere medicinam. in Levit. hom. v. § 4: Discant sacerdotes Domini, qui Ecclesiis praesunt, quia pars eis data est cum his, quorum delicta repropitiaverint. Quid autem est repropitiare delictum? Si assumseris peccatorem, et monendo, hortando, docendo, instruendo adduxeris eum ad poenitentiam, ab errore correxeris, a vitiis emendaveris, et effeceris eum talem, ut ei converso propitius fiat Deus pro delicto, repropitiasse diceris.

[14] The determinations Constitt. Apost. ii. 16, 21—24, are distinguished by great mildness. Comp. Drey über die Constit. S. 51.

[15] Comp. § 53, not. 39, § 59, not. 10. So also Cyprian before the Decian persecution Testim. adv. Judaeos iii. c. 28: non posse in ecclesia remitti ei, qui in Deum deliquerit. On the contrary in Rome the penitent lapsi were admitted on the sick-bed. Ep. Cleri Rom. ad Cler. Carthag. Among Cyprian's letters, ep. 2.

[16] Comp. above § 53, not. 44. Dionysius Alex. ap. Euseb. h. e. vi. 42, 3: *οἱ θεῖοι μάρτυρες,—οἱ νῦν τοῦ Χριστοῦ πάρεδροι καὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ κοινωνοί, καὶ μέτοχοι τῆς κρίσεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ συνδικάζοντες αὐτῷ, τῶν παραπεπτωκότων ἀδελφῶν—τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν καὶ μετάνοιαν ἰδόντες, δεκτήν τε γενέσθαι δυναμένην τῷ θεῷ—δοκιμάσαντες, εἰσεδέξαντο καὶ συνήγαγον καὶ συνέστησαν, καὶ προσευχῶν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐστιάσεων ἐκοινώνησαν.—τί ἡμῖν πρακτέον; σύμψηφοι καὶ ὁμογνώμονες αὐτοῖς καταστῶμεν, καὶ τὴν κρίσιν αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν χάριν φυλάξωμεν, καὶ τοῖς ἐλεηθεῖσιν ὑπ' αὐτῶν χρηστευσώμεθα; ἢ τὴν κρισιν αὐτῶν ἄδεκτον ποιησωμεθα, καὶ δοκιμαστὰς αὐτοὺς τῆς ἐκείνων γνώμης ἐπιστήσωμεν, καὶ τὴν χρηστότητα λυπήσωμεν, καὶ τὴν τάξιν ἀνασκευάσωμεν;*

[17] On these cases see Cypriani epist. 10, 11, 14, 29. Epist. Luciani

dispute, as well as the great number of the lapsed, occasioned a renunciation of the fundamental principle, of always refusing reconciliation with the church to the lapsed, immediately after the Decian persecution, in Africa.[18] On the other hand, this

(Cyprian. 21): Cum benedictus martyr Paulus adhuc in corpore esset, vocavit me et dixit mihi: Luciane, coram Christo dico tibi, ut si quis post arcessitionem meam abs te pacem petierit. da in nomine meo. Epist. 16: Universi Confessores Cypriano Papae Salutem! Scias, nos universis, de quibus apud te ratio constiterit, quid post commissum egerint, dedisse pacem, et hanc formam per te et aliis Episcopis innotescere voluimus. Optamus te cum sanctis Martyribus pacem habere. Praesente de Clero et Exorcista et Lectore, Lucianus scripsit.—Cyprian. epist. 22, ad Clerum Romanum: Quae res majorem nobis conflat invidiam, ut nos, cum singulorum causas audire et excutere coeperimus, videamur multis negare, quod se nunc omnes jactant a Martyribus et Confessoribus accepisse. Denique hujus seditionis origo jam coepit. Nam in provincia nostra per aliquot civitates in Praepositos impetus per multitudinem factus est, et pacem, quam semel cuncti a martyribus et Confessoribus datam clamitabant, confestim sibi repraesentari coëgerunt, territis et subactis Praepositis suis, qui ad resistendum minus virtute animi et robore fidei praevalebant. Apud nos etiam quidam turbulenti, qui vix a nobis in praeteritum regebantur, et in nostram praesentiam differebantur, per hanc epistolam (Confessorum ep. 16) velut quibusdam facibus accensi, plus exardescere, et pacem sibi datam extorquere coeperunt. Cyprian's decisions regarding the praerogativa Martyrum (see Epist. 12, above not. 10.) Lib. de lapsis: Credimus quidem posse apud judicem plurimum Martyrum merita et opera justorum: sed cum judicii vies venerit, cum post occasum saeculi hujus et mundi ante tribunal Christi populus ejus adstiterit. Caeterum si quis praepropera festinatione temerarius remissionem peccatorum dare se cunctis putat posse, aut audet Domini praecepta rescindere, non tantum nihil prodest, sed et obest lapsis. Provocasse est iram non servasse sententiam, nec misericordiam prius Dei deprecandum putare, sed contempto Domino de sua facultate praesumere.—Mandant martyres aliquid fieri? sed si justa, si licita;—ante est, ut sciamus illos de Deo impetrasse quod postulant, tunc facere quod mandant. Cyprian deferred the final decision respecting the lapsed to a council which was to be held after persecution had ceased, (ep. 9, 11): but he allowed that before this, those lapsi furnished with libellis pacis might be re-admitted on the sick-bed. Ep. 12, 13, see above not. 10. Comp. Rettberg's Cyprianus S. 64.

[18] Respecting the Synod held at Carthage on this account 251, and in justification of it, see Cypriani ep. 52 ad Antonianum: Et quidem primum, quoniam de meo quoque actu motus videris, mea apud te et persona et causa purganda est, ne me aliquis existimet a proposito meo leviter recessisse, et cum evangelicum vigorem primo et inter initia defenderim, postmodum videar animum meum a disciplina et censura priore flexisse, ut his, qui libellis conscientiam suam maculaverint, vel nefanda sacrificia commiserint, laxandam pacem putaverim. Quod utrumque non sine librata diu et ponderata ratione a me factum est.

montanistic rigour continued in its greatest extent beyond this period, in Spain.[19]

Nam cum—proelium gloriosi certaminis in persecutione ferveret, toto hortatu et pleno impetu militum vires fuerant excitandae, et maxime lapsorum mentes—fortiter animandae, ut poenitentiae viam non solum precibus et lamentationibus sequerentur, sed—ad confessionis potius ardorem et martyrii gloriam nostris increpiti vocibus provocarentur.—Secundum quod tamen ante fuerat destinatum, persecutione sopita,—copiosus Episcoporum numerus—in unum convenimus, et scripturis divinis ex utraque parte prolatis, temperamentum salubri moderatione libravimus, ut nec in totum spes communicationis et pacis lapsis denegaretur, ne plus desperatione deficerent,—nec tamen rursus censura evangelica solveretur, ut ad communicationem temere prosilirent; sed traheretur diu poenitentia, et rogaretur dolenter paterna clementia, et examinarentur causae et voluntates et necessitates singulorum.—Ac si minus sufficiens Episcoporum in Africa numerus videbitur, etiam Romam super hac re scripsimus ad Cornelium collegam nostrum; qui et ipse cum plurimis coëpiscopis habito concilio in eandem nobiscum sententiam pari gravitate et salubri moderatione consensit.—Nec putes, frater carissime, hinc aut virtutem fratrum minui aut martyria deficere, quod lapsis laxata sit poenitentia, et quod poenitentibus spes pacis oblata.—Nam et moechis a nobis poenitentiae tempus conceditur et pax datur (comp. § 53. not. 39, § 59, not. 4). Non tamen iccirco virginitas in ecclesia deficit, &c.—Miror autem quosdam sic obstinatos esse, ut dandam non putent lapsis poenitentiam, aut poenitentibus existiment veniam denegandam, cum scriptum sit: Memento unde ecciderís, et age poenitentiam, et fac priora opera (Apoc. ii. 5). After quoting many similar passages: Quod legentes scilicet et tenentes neminem putamus a fructu satisfactionis et spe pacis arcendum, cum sciamus juxta scripturarum divinarum fidem, auctore et hortatore ipso Deo, et ad agendam poenitentiam peccatores redigi, et veniam atque indulgentiam poenitentibus non denegari. In this sense it was even made a general church law by the Conc. Nicaen. c. 13, ὥστε, εἴ τις ἐξοδεύοι, τοῦ τελευταίου καὶ ἀναγκαιοτάτου ἐφοδίου μὴ ἀποστερεῖσθαι.

[19] Comp. Concil. Illiberit. above § 59, note 10. So says Pacian, bishop of Barcelona, about 370, in his book of capital sins: Paraeneticus ad poenitentiam (Bibl. PP. max. T. iv.) peccatis capitalibus: Reliqua peccata meliorum operum compensatione curantur. Haec quicunque post fidem fecerit, Dei faciem non videbit. Cf. Innocentii i. Epist. 6, ad Exsuperium Episc. Tolosanum (in the year 405) c. 2: Et hoc quaesitum est, quid de his observari oporteat, qui post baptismum omni tempore incontinentiae voluptatibus dediti, in extremo fine vitae suae poenitentiam simul et reconciliationem communionis exposcunt. De his observatio prior durior, posterior interveniente misericordia inclinatior. Nam consuetudo prior tenuit, ut concederetur poenitentia, sed communio negaretur.

§ 72.

(CONTINUATION) CONTROVERSY CONCERNING MATTERS OF CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

1. *The schism of Felicissimus in Carthage.*[1] A party already dissatisfied with the selection of *Cyprian* as bishop, afterwards continued in a divided relation, in opposition to the bishop, who was extremely jealous of his dignity. The Decian persecution put an end to the dispute arising between Cyprian and the presbyter *Novatus.*[2] But during that trying time, some presbyters re-admitted the lapsed (Cypriani ep. 9) solely on the strength of the libelli pacis of the martyrs, which were too freely granted, without regard to the bishop of Carthage, who had been obliged to leave his church. Cyprian found fault with this. But the party of the dissatisfied increased notwithstanding, at whose head the deacon *Felicissimus* appeared, and to which several confessors also were now added. This party now refused to obey the commands of the bishop, who had fled from persecution,[3] and went on adding to its numbers by the reception of the lapsed.[4] After Cyprian's return (251) they were excommunicated, and chose Fortunatus for their bishop, but do not appear to have long survived.

[1] Sources: Cyprian. ep. 38, 39, 40, 42, 55. Walch's Ketzerhist. ii. 288. Rettberg's Cyprianus S. 89.

[2] At the time of the Novatian controversy Cyprian says of him ep. 49: Idem est Novatus, qui apud nos primum discordiae et schismatis incendium seminavit, qui quosdam istic ex fratribus ab Episcopo segregavit, qui in ipsa persecutione ad evertendas fratrum mentes alia quaedam persecutio nostris fuit. Ipse est, qui Felicissimum satellitem suum, Diaconum, nec permittente me, nec sciente, sua factione et ambitione constituit.—urgentibus fratribus imminebat cognitionis dies, quo apud nos causa ejus ageretur, nisi persecutio antevenisset.

[3] In particular, Felicissimus withstood a commission sent by Cyprian to inquire about the substance of the poor, Cypr. ep. 38.

[4] Cypriani epist. 40 ad plebem: conjurationis suae memores, et antiqua illa contra Episcopatum meum, imo contra suffragium vestrum et Dei judicium venena retinentes, instaurant veterem contra nos impugnationem suam, et sacrilegas machinationes insidiis solitis denuo revocant. Hi fomenta olim quibusdam confessoribus et hortamenta tribuebant, ne concordarent cum episcopo suo, ne ecclesiasticam disciplinam cum fide et quiete juxta praecepta dominica continerent, &c.—nunc se ad lapsorum perniciem venenata sua deceptione verterunt, ut aegros et

2. *Novatian schism.*[5] The presbyter *Novatian* (in *Eusebius* Νοουάτος) was dissatisfied with the choice of the bishop *Cornelius* at Rome (251) because Cornelius, in his opinion, had conducted himself with too great lenity towards the lapsed. In the controversy that now ensued, in which the Carthaginian presbyter *Novatus* proved particularly active in favour of Novatian,[6] the latter returned to the old principle that none of the lapsed ought to be admitted to church communion.[7] Hence arose a division in the church. Novatian was chosen bishop by his party at Rome. Though the other bishops, particularly *Cyprian* at Carthage, and *Dionysius* at Alexandria, stood on the side of Cornelius, yet many in different countries joined the strict party.[8] At first the Novatians (καθαροί) declared themselves only against the re-admission of the lapsi;[9] but afterwards they fully return-

saucios—a medela vulneris sui avocent, et intermissis precibus et orationibus, quibus Dominus longa et continua satisfactione placandus est, ad exitiosam temeritatem mendacio captiosae pacis invitent.

[5] Sources: Cyprian. epist. 41—52. Cornelii Rom. ep. ad Fabium Antioch. (ap. Euseb. vi. 43), Dionys. Alex. ep. ad Novatianum (ib. c. 45), et ad Dionysium Rom. (ibid. vii. 8). Walch's Ketzerhist. ii. 185.

[6] Although he had formerly ordained Felicissimus deacon (note 2), it does not thence follow that he afterwards was of the same opinion with him regarding the readmission of the lapsed, and still later that he came over to the opposite view at Rome. See Mosheim de rebus Christ. ante C. M. p. 518. Perhaps it was even dissatisfaction with his party that urged him to go from Carthage to Rome.

[7] Formerly Novatian's opinion was milder, in the letter written by him, epist. Cleri Rom. ad Cypr. (Ep. Cypr. 31), cf. Cypr. ep. 52.

[8] Even Fabius, bishop of Antioch, was ὑποκατακλινόμενος τῷ σχίσματι (Euseb. vi. 44), and at a Synod in Antioch τοῦ Νοουάτου κρατύνειν τινὲς ἐπεχείρουν τὸ σχίσμα (l. c. 46). Cf. Socrat. iv. 28. Respecting Marcian bishop of Arles, see § 68, note 14.

[9] So Novatian, in a circular-letter, required all the churches (Socrates iv. 28), μὴ δέχεσθαι τοὺς ἐπιθυκότας εἰς τὰ μυστήρια· ἀλλὰ προτρέπειν μὲν αὐτοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν, τὴν δὲ συγχώρησιν ἐπιτρέπειν θεῷ, τῷ δυναμένῳ καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντι συγχωρεῖν ἁμαρτήματα. Hence Cyprian ep. 52 accuses Novatian of inconsistency: Aut si se cordis et renis scrutatorem constituit et judicem, per omnia aequaliter judicet, et—fraudatores et moechos a latere atque a comitatu suo separet, quando multo et gravior et pejor sit moechi quam libellatici causa. O frustrandae fraternitatis irrisio, o miserorum—caduca deceptio!—hortari ad satisfactionis poenitentiam, et subtrahere de satisfactione medicinam: dicere fratribus nostris: plange et lacrimas funde, et diebus ac noctibus ingemisce, et pro abluendo et purgando delicto tuo largiter et frequenter operare, sed extra ecclesiam post omnia ista morieris: quaecumque ad pacem pertinent facies, sed nullam pacem, quam quaeris, accipies.

ed to the old African notion, that all who had defiled themselves by gross sins after baptism should be for ever excluded from the church,[10] because the church itself would be tainted if they were received again. In accordance with this view they declared all other churches to have forfeited the rights of a Christian church; and baptized anew those who came over to them.[11] This party was widely extended, and continued for a long time.[12] In Phrygia they united with the remnant of the Montanists.[13]

3. *Controversy concerning the baptism of heretics.*[14] The custom prevalent in Africa, Egypt, Syria, and Asia Minor, of regarding reclaimed heretics as unbaptised, was considered objectionable at Rome,[15] where they were prepared for re-admission without baptism, by passing through the *gradus poenitentiae;* especially since the time the Novatians began to re-baptise the Christians who had joined them. In Africa, too, there arose doubts regarding it; but two Carthaginian councils (255, 256) confirmed the old practice. When the second council informed *Stephen,* bishop of Rome (253—257) of its decisions, in a synodical letter (ep. Cypr. 72), it received from him a haughty reply disapprov-

[10] Acesius, a Novatian bishop, at the Council of Nice, says (Socrates i. 10): οὐ χρὴ τοὺς μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ἡμαρτηκότας ἁμαρτίαν, ἣν πρὸς θάνατον καλοῦσιν αἱ θεῖαι γραφαί, τῆς κοινωνίας τῶν θείων μυστηρίων ἀξιοῦσθαι· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ μετάνοιαν μὲν αὐτοὺς προτρέπειν, ἐλπίδα δὲ τῆς ἀφέσεως μὴ παρὰ τῶν ἱερέων, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκδέχεσθαι, τοῦ δυναμένου καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντος συγχωρεῖν ἁμαρτήματα.

[11] Such also was the practice of the African church. So Tertullian. de baptismo 15, de praesc. 12, de pudicit. 19, and a council in Carthage under Agrippinus, about 200 (Cypr. ep. 71, 73). Cf. Münteri primordia Eccl. Afric. p. 150 ss.

[12] Constantine's forbearance towards them, Cod. Theodos. lib. xvi. tit. 5, l. 2. Novatianos non adeo comperimus praedamnatos, ut iis, quae petiverunt, crederemus minime largienda. Itaque ecclesiae suae domos, et loca sepulcris apta sine inquietudine eos firmiter possidere praecipimus etc. (A.D. 326). The mildness of the Nicene council towards them, Can. Nic. 8: Καθαροὺς χειροθετουμένους μένειν οὕτως ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ.

[13] Comp. especially Socrates iv. 28. The Phrygian Novatians forbade second marriage (ibid. v. 22), and celebrated the passover with the Quartodecimani (iv. 28, v. 21).

[14] Walch's Ketzerhist. ii. 310. Rettberg's Cyprianus S. 156.

[15] The testimonies for Africa, see note 11. For Egypt Clemens Alex. strom. i. 375: τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ αἱρετικὸν οὐκ οἰκεῖον καὶ γνήσιον ὕδωρ. Comp. Dionysius Alex., below note 20. For Syria Constit. Apost. vi. 15. For Asia Minor the two councils in Iconium (in the year 235, see Firmilian in epist. Cypr. 75), and Synnada, cf. Dionys. Alex. ap. Euseb. vii. 7, 3.

ing of them.[16] This led to an interchange of violent letters between Stephen and Cyprian.[17] The former broke off all communion with the Africans; but notwithstanding this they repeated in the most emphatic terms their opinions at a third council at Carthage, (1st Sept. 256).[18] *Firmilian*, bishop of Caesarea, in Cappadocia, assured them (epist. Cypr. 75) with bitter observations on Stephen,[19] of the full assent of the churches in his pro-

[16] Cyprian's principle was (ep. 70): neminem foris baptizari extra Ecclesiam posse, cum sit baptisma unum in sancta Ecclesia constitutum. On the other hand Stephen (epist. 74): si quis ergo a quacunque haeresi venerit ad vos, nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est, ut manus illi imponatur in poenitentiam.—qui in nomine Jesu Christi ubicunque et quomodocunque baptizantur, innovati et sanctificati judicentur. Cyprian adds: in tantum Stephani fratris nostri obstinatio dura prorupit, ut etiam de Marcionis baptismo, item Valentini et Apelletis, et caeterorum blasphemantium in Deum patrem contendat filios Deo nasci.

[17] The earlier letters of Cyprian on this affair are ep. 70—73. Notices of the controversial writings between him and Stephen are found in Cypr. epist. 74 ad Pompejum and Firmiliani ep. ad Cypr. (ep. Cypr. 75). Cyprian says of Stephen's letter (ep. 74): Caetera vel superba vel ad rem non pertinentia, vel sibi ipsi contraria, quae imperite atque improvide scripsit, &c.—Quae ista obstinatio est, quaeve praesumtio, humanam traditionem divinae dispositioni anteponere, nec animadvertere, indignari et irasci Deum, quoties divina praecepta solvit et praeterit humana traditio.—Nec consuetudo, quae apud quosdam obrepserat, impedire debit, quominus veritas praevaleat et vincat. Nam consuetudo sine veritate vetustas erroris est. On the other hand (ep. 75): non pudet Stephanum —Cyprianum pseudochristum et pseudoapostolum et dolosum operarium dicere. The consequences to be deduced from this controversy respecting the papal supremacy afterwards asserted, may be seen in J. La Placette observatt. historico-eccl., quibus eruitur veteris ecclesiae sensus circa Pontif. Rom. potestatem in definiendis fidei rebus. Amsterd. 1695. 8. p. 102 ss.

[18] The Acts of it in Augustini de baptismo contra Donatistas lib. vi. et vii.—Also in Cypriani Opp.

[19] Ex. gr. gratiam referre Stephano in isto possumus, quod per illius inhumanitatem nunc effectum sit, ut fidei et sapientiae vestrae experimentum caperemus.—Sed haec interim, quae a Stephano gesta sunt, praetereantur, ne dum audaciae et insolentiae ejus meminimus, de rebus ab eo improbe gestis longiorem moestitiam nobis inferamus.—Atque ego in hac parte juste indignor ad hanc tam apertam et manifestam Stephani stultitiam, quod qui sic de Episcopatus sui loco gloriatur, et se successionem Petri tenere contendit, super quem fundamenta Ecclesiae collocata sunt, multas alias petras inducat.—Lites et dissensiones quantas parâsti (Stephane) per ecclesias totius mundi? Peccatum vero quam magnum tibi exaggerasti, quando te a tot gregibus scidisti? Exscidisti enim temet ipsum: noli te fallere. Siquidem ille est vere schismaticus, qui se a communione Ecclesiasticae unitatis apostatam fecerit (consequently not

vince; and Dionysius also, bishop of Alexandria, decidedly condemned the conduct of Stephen.[20] After Stephen's death, peace was immediately restored to the church,[21] although difference of opinion on the disputed point continued for a long time.[22] In the mean time, even now, an intermediate opinion had arisen in the western church,[23] which afterwards became the prevailing one.

4. *Meletian schism.* During the Diocletian persecution, *Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis* in Thebais, maintained, that the lapsed should not be admitted to penance before peace should have

from a Roman centrum unitatis). Dum enim putas omnes a te abstinere posse, solum te ab omnibus abstinuisti, &c. This letter, so unpleasant to the Romish see (exant in 26 codd.), was purposely omitted in the edition of Cyprian Romae ap. Paul. Manutium 1563, and first printed in that of Guil. Morellii. Paris. 1564, who is bitterly censured for it by Latinus Latinius and Pamelius. Christ. Lupus (ad Tertull. libr. de praescr. Bruxell. 1675. 4.) first denied the authenticity of the letter. A Franciscan Raimund Missori (in duas celeberr. epist. Firm. et Cypr. disputt. crit. Venet. 1733. 4.), the Jesuit R. J. Tournemine (mémoires de Trévoux de 1734 p. 2246, ss.), the Franciscan Marcellinus Molkenbuhr (in two dissertations. Münster 1790 and 1793. 4.), and A. Ant. Morcelli Africa christiana ii. 138 declare, moreover, that Cyprian's letters respecting the baptism of heretics are forged. These arbitrary assumptions, which none else has thought fit to repeat, have been refuted by J. H. Sbaralea germana S. Cypr. et Afrorum nec non Firmiliani opinio de haereticorum baptism. Bonon. 1741, 4., and in academic dissertations by G. G. Preu. Jenae 1738, and D. Cotta. Tüb. 1740.

[20] Dion. ep. ad Sixtum II. (successor of Stephen 257) ap. Euseb. vii. 5: ἐπεστάλκει (Στέφανος) μὲν οὖν πρότερον καὶ περὶ Ἑλένου καὶ περὶ Φιρμιλιανοῦ καὶ πάντων τῶν τε ἀπὸ τῆς Κελικίας καὶ Καππαδοκίας καὶ Γαλατίας, καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐξῆς ὁμορούντων ἐθνῶν, ὡς οὐδὲ ἐκείνοις κοινωνήσων διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ταύτην αἰτίαν, ἐπειδὴ τοὺς αἱρετικούς, φησιν, ἀναβαπτίζουσι. Καὶ σκόπει τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ πράγματος. Ὄντως γὰρ δόγματα περὶ τούτου γέγονεν ἐν ταῖς μεγίσταις τῶν ἐπισκόπων συνόδοις, ὡς πυνθάνομαι, ὥστε τοὺς προσίοντας ἀπὸ αἱρέσεων προκατηχηθέντας, εἶτα ἀπολούεσθαι καὶ ἀνακαθαίρεσθαι τὸν τῆς παλαιᾶς καὶ ἀκαθάρτου ζύμης ῥύπον. Καὶ περὶ τούτων αὐτοῦ πάντων δεόμενος, ἐπέστειλα. Hieronymus catal. c. 69:—Dionysius—in Cypriani et Africanae synodi dogma consentiens de haereticis rebaptizandis.

[21] Pontius in Vita Cypriani, where he speaks of his martyrdom: Jam de Xisto (successor of Stephen), bono et pacifico Sacerdote, ac propterea beatissimo Martyre, ab Urbe nuncius venerat.

[22] Accordingly, the Greek fathers, even of the fourth century, reject the baptism of heretics. See below § 101. not. 10.

[23] Can. Arelat. 8: De Afris, quod propria lege sua utuntur ut rebaptizent, placuit, ut si ad ecclesiam aliquis de haeresi venerit, interrogent eum symbolum; et si perviderint, eum in Patre, et Filio, et Spiritu Sancto esse baptizatum, manus ei tantum imponatur, ut accipiat Spiritum Sanctum. Quod si interrogatus non responderit hanc trinitatem, baptizetur.

been restored. On this ground he withdrew from his metropolitan *Peter of Alexandria* (306), and began to assume the duties of the metropolitan's office among the churches of his party.[24] This schism continued more than a century.

5. *Donatist schism.*[25] As early as the Diocletian persecution there arose at Carthage a fanatical party in opposition to the bishop *Mensurius* and his archdeacon *Caecilianus*, because *they* had contended against the perverseness with which many Christians longed for martyrdom partly from fanaticism and partly from still more impure motives.[26] When therefore, after Mensu-

[24] Some original documents relating to this controversy, especially a letter from four Egyptian bishops to Meletius, have been communicated to the public by Scipio Maffei osservazioni letterarie T. iii. p. 11 ss. (Verona 1738). The account of Epiphanius haer. 68 which is favourable to Meletius agrees best with this letter. Different but partial against Meletius is the representation of Athanasius apologia contra Arianos § 59, which Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret for the most part follow. Walch iv. 355. Neander ii. i. 463.

[25] Sources: Optatus (bishop of Mileve about 368) de schismate Donatistarum libb. vii. (vi.?) ed. L. E. du Pin. Paris. 1700 (in which edition also: Monumenta vetera ad Donatist. hist. pertinentia and historia Donatistarum. Augustinus in several works (all contained in the 9th part of the Benedictine edition, in its appendix are also Excerpta et scripta vetera ad Donatistarum historiam pertinentia), for example contra epistolam Parmeniani libb. 3, de baptismo libb. 7, contra literas Petiliani libb. 3, contra Cresconium libb. 4, breviculus collationum contra Donatistas libb. 3, &c.—cf. Valesius de schismate Donatist. diss. (appended to his edition of Eusebius). Melchior Leydecker historia eccles. Africanae. Ultraj. 1690. 4. p. 467. Historia Donatistarum ex Norisianis schedis excerpta in H. Norisii opp. omn. ed. a Petro et Hieron. fratribus Balleriniis. (Veron. 1729. 1732. 4 t. fol.) Tom. iv. Walch iv. 3. Neander ii. i. 387.

[26] Comp. the contents of a letter addressed by Mensurius to Secundus, bishop of Tigisis, in Augustin. brevicul. collat. diei iii. c. 13. no. 25: eos, qui se offerrent persecutionibus non comprehensi, et ultro dicerent, se habere scripturas, quas non traderent, a quibus hoc nemo quaesierat, displicuisse Mensurio, et ab eis honorandis eum prohibuisse Christianos. Quidam etiam in eadem epistola facinorosi arguebantur et fisci debitores, qui occasione persecutiones vel carere vellent onerosa multis debitis vita, vel purgare se putarent, et quasi abluere facinora sua vel certe adquirere pecuniam, et in custodia deliciis perfrui de obsequio Christianorum. With this coincides what had been objected to Caecilian immediately after his election (l. c. cap. 14. no. 26): cum esset diaconus, victum afferri martyribus in custodia constitutis prohibuisse dicebatur. There is manifestly great exaggeration in the Donatist Actis Saturnini presbyteri, Felicis, Dativi, Ampelii et aliorum c. 17 (in Baluzii miscellan, T. ii. p. 72. du Pin Monumenta p. 156: On the other hand, this appendix is left out in the Actis SS. and apud Ruinart where he is called): (Mensurius) tyranno saevior, carnifice crudelior, idoneum sceleris sui ministrum dia-

rius's death, (311) Caecilianus was chosen his successor, this party set up in opposition to him *Majorinus*, who was soon succeeded by *Donatus the great* (313). In this proceeding they were supported by the Numidian bishops, particularly Secundus, bishop of Tigisis, and Donatus, bishop of Casae Nigrae. The pretext was, that Caecilianus had been consecrated by a Tráditor, *Felix, bishop of Aptunga.* This *pars Majorini*, afterwards called *pars Donati, Donatistae*, who gained many adherents in Africa, on account of their attaching great value to purity in the church, brought their complaint against Caecilian before Constantine; the first example of spiritual affairs being laid before a civil ruler for his decision. Constantine at first entrusted Miltiades, bishop of Rome, along with three Gaelic bishops (313) with an inquiry into the affair; and afterwards a council was assembled at Arelate for the purpose of investigating it (314). Both decisions, as well as the judgment of the emperor himself, (316) occasioned by a new appeal, proved unfavourable to the Donatists. But though severe laws also had been passed against them, yet they persisted in their opposition, and continued, full of enmity towards the catholic church, for more than a century in Africa.

§ 73.

ASCETICISM.

In this division of time, we still find in the church a living consciousness of Christian freedom, which was manifested, especially at the beginning of the period, in opposition to the ascetic precepts of the Montanists.[1] Fasting continued to be left to the

conum suum elegit Caecilianum: idemque lora et flagra cum armatis ante fores carceris ponit, ut ab ingressu atque aditu cunctos, qui victum potumque in carcerem martyribus afferebant, gravi affectos injuria propulsaret. Et caedebantur a Caeciliano passim qui ad alendos martyres veniebant, sitientibus intus in vinculis confessoribus, pocula frangebantur ante carceris limina, cibi passim lacerandi canibus spargebantur, &c.

[1] Tertull. de jejuniis c. 2: Certe in evangelio illos dies jejuniis determinatos putant (Psychici), in quibus ablatus est sponsus, et hos esse jam solos legitimos jejuniorum Christianorum, abolitis legalibus et propheticis vetustatibus. Itaque de caetero indifferenter jejunandum, ex arbitrio, non ex imperio novae disciplinae, pro temporibus et causis unius-

free choice of each; except that ecclesiastical custom had determined certain days as especially appropriate for that purpose, which were very different in different churches.[2] Besides, on particular occasions the churches were summoned by their bishops to a general fast;[3] and in like manner certain fasts were imposed

cujusque. Sic et Apostolos observasse, nullum aliud imponentes jugum certorum et in commune omnibus obeundorum jejuniorum: proinde nec stationum, quae et ipsae suos quidem dies habeant, quartae feriae et sextae, passive tamen currant, neque sub lege praecepti—cum fides libera in Christo ne Judaicae quidem legi abstinentiam quorundam ciborum debeat, semel in totum macellum ab Apostolo admissa, detestatore eorum, qui sicut nubere prohibeant, ita jubeant cibis abstinere a Deo conditis: et ideo nos (the Montanists) esse jam tunc praenotatos in novissimis temporibus abscedentes a fide, intendentes spiritibus mundi seductoribus, doctrinis mendaciloquorum inustam habentes conscientiam (1 Tim. iv. 1, 2). Sit et cum Galatis nos quoque percuti ajunt observatores dierum et mensium et annorum (Gal. iv. 10, cf. c. 14: galaticamur plane). Jaculantur interea et Esaiam pronunciasse: non tale jejunium Dominus elegit, id est, non abstinentiam cibi, sed opera justitiae, quae subtexit (Es. lviii. 5, 6). Et ipsum Dominum in Evangelio ad omnem circa victum scrupulositatem compendio respondisse, non his coinquinari hominem, quae in os inferantur, sed quae ex ore proferantur, cum et ipse manducaret et biberet usque in nationem: Ecce homo vorator et potator (Matth. xi. 19). Sic et Apostolum docere, quod esca nos Deo non commendet: neque abundantes, si edamus, neque deficientes, si non edamus (1 Cor. viii. 8). Comp. Neander's Antignosticus S. 279 ff.

[2] Origenes hom. x. in Levitic. § 2: Habemus enim quadragesimae dies jejuniis consecratos. Habemus quartam et sextam septimanae dies, quibus solemniter jejunamus. Is this translation of Rufinus correct? cf. Dionys. epist. can. ad Basilid. can. 1: *μηδὲ τὰς ἓξ τῶν νηστειῶν ἡμέρας ἴσως, μηδὲ ὁμοίως πάντες διαμένουσιν· ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν καὶ πάσας ὑπερτιθέασιν* (i. e. fasting all days successively. Respecting these *ὑπερθέσεις*, superpositiones see Bingham vol. ix. p. 229. Routh reliqu. sacr. ii. p. 419), *ἄσιτοι διατελοῦντες, οἱ δὲ δύο, οἱ δὲ τρεῖς, οἱ δὲ τέσσαρας, οἱ δὲ οὐδεμίαν.—εἰ δέ τινες οὐχ ὅπως οὐχ ὑπερτιθέμενοι, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ νηστεύσαντες ἢ καὶ τρυφήσαντες τὰς προαγούσας τέσσαρας, εἶτα ἐλθόντες ἐπὶ τὰς τελευταίας δύο καὶ μόνας ἡμέρας, αὐτὰς ὑπερτιθέντες, τήν τε παρασκευὴν καὶ τὸ σάββατον, μέγα τι καὶ λαμπρὸν ποιεῖν νομίζουσιν, ἂν μέχρι τῆς ἑῴ διαμείνωσιν, τούτους οὐκ οἶμαι τὴν ἴσην ἄθλησιν πεποιῆσθαι τοῖς τὰς πλείονας ἡμέρας προησκηκόσι.* Const. Apost. v. 18: *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις οὖν τοῦ Πάσχα νηστεύετε ἀρχόμενοι ἀπὸ δευτέρας μέχρι τῆς παρασκευῆς καὶ σαββάτου ἓξ ἡμέρας κ. τ. λ.*

[3] Tertull. de jejun. c. 13, comp. § 53, not. 33. The bishops sometimes showed themselves ambitious even here. Origenes in Matth. commentariorum series § 10: Qui docent etiam abstinere a cibis, et alia hujusmodi, ad quae non omnino oportet cogere homines fideles, alligant per verbum expositionis suae onera gravia, citra voluntatem Christi dicentis: Jugum meum suave est, et onus meum leve est: et imponunt ea, quantum ad verbum suum, super humeros hominum, curvantes eos et cadere

on the penitents.[4] External asceticism generally was progressively and increasingly valued;[5] and there were very many ascetics of both sexes, although they were bound by no irrevocable vow.[6] The Alexandrian distinction of a higher and lower virtue had a special influence in recommending this asceticism.[7] It is true that the renouncing of sensual enjoyments (ἐγκρατεία), according to *Clement of Alexandria*, was only the means for attaining to that higher virtue, *i. e.* to that passionless state, (ἀπάθεια) whereby man is made like to God and united to Him;[8] so that whoever has reached this point has no more need of that renunciation of sensual gratification;[9] but afterwards, the opinion that

facientes sub pondere gravium mandatorum eos, qui bajulare ea non sufferunt. Et frequentur videre est, eos qui talia docent, contraria agere sermonibus suis etc.

[4] Even, it would seem, of forty days in imitation of Jesus. Petri Alex. can. 1.

[5] cf. Cyprianus de habitu virginum; Methodii convivium decem virginum (in Combefisii auctarium novissimum biblioth. Graecorum Patrum. P. I. p. 64 ss.), and the two supposititious letters to virgins that pass under the name of Clement of Rome, which probably appeared about this time, and were first communicated to the public in the Syriac language by Wetstein N. T. tom. ii. (Moehler, Patrologie i. 67, declares them genuine).

[6] Cypriani epist. 62: Quod si (virgines) ex fide se Christo dicaverunt, pudicae et castae sine ulla fabula perseverent, et ita fortes et stabiles praemium virginitatis exspectant. Si autem perseverare nolunt, vel non possunt, melius est ut nubant, quam in ignem delictis suis cadant. Certe nullum fratribus aut sororibus scandalum faciant etc. Concil. Illiberit. can. 13, is directed against the lustful excesses of the virgins, quae se Deo dicaverint, and consequently does not belong to our present purpose. On the other hand, Conc. Ancyran. can. 19: Ὅσοι παρθενίαν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, ἀθετοῦσι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, τὸν τῶν διγάμων ὅρον ἐκπληρούτωσαν. Bigamists according to Basilii. ep. can. iv. were subjected to the penance of a year.

[7] See above 63, not. 25.

[8] See § 63, not. 27. Daehne de γνώσει Clementis p. 107.

[9] Clem. Alex. strom. iv. p. 626 of the γνωστικός: οὐκ ἐγκρατὴς οὗτος ἔτι, ἀλλ' ἐν ἕξει γέγονεν ἀπαθείας. vii. p. 874: διὸ καὶ ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει καὶ γαμεῖ (ὁ γνωστικὸς), οὐ προηγουμένως ἀλλὰ ἀνάγκαίως. τὸ γαμεῖν δὲ, ἐὰν ὁ λόγος ἔρῃ, λέγω, καὶ ὡς καθήκει. Γενόμενος γὰρ τέλειος (maritus) εἰκόνας ἔχει τοὺς Ἀποστόλους, καὶ τῷ ὄντι ἀνὴρ οὐκ ἐν τῷ μονήρει ἐπανελέσθαι δείκνυται βίον, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνος ἄνδρας νικᾷ, ὁ γάμῳ καὶ παιδοποιΐα, καὶ τῇ τοῦ οἴκου προνοίᾳ ἀνηδόνως τε καὶ ἀλυπήτως ἐγγυμνασάμενος, μετὰ τῆς τοῦ οἴκου κηδεμονίας ἀδιάστατος τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ γενόμενος ἀγάπης, καὶ πάσης κατεξανιστάμενος πείρας, τῆς διὰ τέκνων καὶ γυναικὸς, οἰκετῶν τε καὶ κτημάτων προσφερομένης. Τῷ δὲ ἀνίκῳ τὰ πολλὰ εἶναι συμβέβηκεν ἀπειράστῳ. cf. lib. iii. p. 546 etc. de Wette Gesch. d. christl. Sittenlehre i. 224.

the higher virtue must manifest itself especially in external asceticism[10] obtained currency, after the example of *Origen*, in the Christian school at Alexandria, as well as among the new Platonists.[11] To this high estimation of celibacy, increased by the cause just mentioned, which sometimes bordered almost upon contempt of the married state,[12] was attached very naturally the

[10] Tzschirner's Fall des Heidenthums i. 435 ff.

[11] Origenes in ep. ad. Rom. lib. iii. (ed. de la Rue iv. p. 507: Donec quis hoc facit tantum quod debet, i. e. ea quae praecepta sunt, inutilis servus est (according to Luc. xvii. 10). Si autem addas aliquid praeceptis, tunc non jam inutilis servus eris, sed dicetur ad te: Euge serve bone et fidelis (Matth. xxv. 21). Quid autem sit quod addatur praeceptis, et supra debitum fiat, Paulus Apostolus dicit: De virginibus autem praeceptum Domini non habeo: consilium autem do, tamquam misericordiam consecutus a Domino (1 Cor. vii. 25). Hoc opus super praeceptum est. Qui ergo completis praeceptis addiderit etiam hoc, ut virginitatem custodiat, non jam inutilis servus, sed servus bonus et fidelis vocabitur. Et iterum praeceptum est, ut hi qui Evangelium annunciant, de Evangelio vivant. Paulus tamen dicit, quia nullo horum usus sum; et ideo non inutilis erat servus, sed fidelis et prudens. Euseb. demonstrat. evang. i. c. 8: *οἱ μαθηταὶ (τοῦ Χριστοῦ)—ὅσα μὲν ἅπτε τὴν ἕξιν διαβεβηκόσι πρὸς τοῦ τελείου διδασκάλου παρήγγελτο, ταῦτα τοῖς οἵοις τε χωρεῖν παρεδίδουν· ὅσα δὲ τοῖς ἔτι τάς ψυχὰς ἐμπαθέσι, καὶ θεραπείας δεομένοις ἐφαρμόζειν ὑπελάμβανον, ταῦτα συγκατιόντες τῇ τῶν πλειόνων ἀσθενείᾳ—φυλάττειν παρεδίδοσαν· ὥστε ἤδη καὶ τῇ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίᾳ δύο βίων νενομοθετῆσθαι τρόπους· τὸν μὲν ὑπερφυῆ, καὶ τῆς κοινῆς καὶ ἀνθρωπίνης πολιτείας ἐπέκεινα, οὐ γάμους, οὐ παιδοποιΐας, οὐδὲ κτῆσιν, οὐδὲ περιουσίας ὕπαρξιν παραδεχόμενον, ὅλον δὲ δι' ὅλου τῆς κοινῆς καὶ συνήθους ἁπάντων ἀνθρώπων ἀγωγῆς παρηλλαγμένον, καὶ μόνῃ τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ θεραπείᾳ προσῳκειωμένον καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἔρωτος οὐρανίου. Οἱ δὴ τόνδε μετιόντες τὸν τρόπον, τῶν ἀνητῶν βίον τεθνάναι δοκοῦντες, καὶ αὐτὸ μόνον τὸ σῶμα φέροντες ἐπὶ γῆς, φρονήματι δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν εἰς οὐρανὸν μετενηνεγμένοι, οἷά τινες θεοί, τὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐφορῶσι βίον, ὑπὲρ τοῦ παντὸς γένους ἱερωμένοι τῷ ἐπὶ πάντων θεῷ, οὐ βουθυσίαις καὶ αἵμασιν,—δόγμασι δὲ ὀρθοῖς ἀληθοῦς εὐσεβείας, ψυχῆς τε διαθέσει κεκαθαρμένης, καὶ προσέτι τοῖς κατ' ἀρετὴν ἔργοις τε καὶ λόγοις. οἷς τὸ θεῖον ἐξιλεούμενοι, τὴν ὑπὲρ σφῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν σφίσιν ὁμογενῶν ἀποτελοῦσιν ἱερουργίαν. Τοιόσδε μὲν οὖν κατέστηκεν ὁ ἐντελὴς τῆς κατὰ τὸν χριστιανισμὸν πολιτείας τρόπος. Ὁ δ' ὑποβεβηκὼς ἀνθρωπινώτερος, οἷος καὶ γάμοις συγκατιέναι σώφροσι καὶ παιδοποιΐαις κ. τ. λ.—Καὶ τις τούτοις δεύτερος εὐσεβείας ἀπενεμήθη βαθμός κ. τ. λ.*

[12] Origenis in Num. hom. vi. (ed. de la Rue t. ii. p. 288): Ego, licet non usquequaque pronunciem, puto tamen quod sint nonnulla etiam communium hominum gesta, quae quamvis peccato careant, non tamen digna videantur, quibis interesse putemus Spiritum sanctum. Ut verbi gratia dixerim, connubia quidem legitima carent quidem peccato, nec tamen tempore illo, quo conjugales actes geruntur, praesentia sancti Spiritus dabitur, etiamsi propheta esse videatur, qui officio generationis obsequitur: namely, Comm. in Matth. t. xvii. (t. iii. p. 827), *ἐν μολυσμῷ πως; ὄντων καὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ τινὶ τῶν χρωμένων ἀφροδισίοις.*

notion of its being especially becoming in priests to renounce the marriage intercourse.[13] And though no general ecclesiastical law was yet enacted on the subject,[14] yet as the priests had already been forbidden to marry a second time, (§ 53, note 28), a regulation was now made in addition that they should only keep the woman whom they had married before ordination; while in office itself, they should not marry;[15] and that the person they had married must have been a virgin.[16] Among ascetics, the dangerous practice arose of taking to themselves virgins for the purpose of living with them in pure spiritual communion, vanquishing all temptations. They called them ἀδελφαί, sorores.[17] Others gave them the appellations συνείσακτοι,[18] subintro-

[13] Euseb. demonstr. evang. i. c. 9: Χρῆναι γὰρ, φησὶν ὁ λόγος, τὸν ἐπίσκοπον γεγονέναι μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα. πλὴν ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἱερωμένοις, καὶ περὶ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ Θεραπείαν ἀσχολουμένοις ἀνέχειν λοιπὸν σφᾶς αὐτοὺς προσήκει τῆς γαμικῆς ὁμιλίας.

[14] It was only the rigid council at Illiberis that ordained Can. 33: Placuit in totum prohibere Episcopis, Presbyteris et Diaconibus vel omnibus Clericis positis in ministerio, abstinere se a conjugibus suis, et non generare filios: quicunque vero fecerit, ab honore Clericatus exterminetur. The meaning is ambiguous, but the true sense is probably this, that conjugal intercourse is forbidden bishops, presbyters, and deacons merely (in totum), and to the inferior clergy as long as they are engaged in the active service of the church. These latter might live together with their wives, can. 65: si cujus Clerici uxor fuerit moechata, et—maritus—non eam statim projecerit, nec in finem accipiat communionem. Examples of married bishops and presbyters, belonging to this period, may be found in Calixtus de conjugio clericorum ed. Henke p. 201.

[15] Const. Ap. vi. 17, Canon Ancyr. x.: Διάκονοι, ὅσοι καθίστανται, παρ' αὐτὴν τὴν κατάστασιν εἰ ἐμαρτύραντο καὶ ἔφασαν χρῆναι γαμῆσαι, μὴ δυνάμενοι οὕτως μένειν· οὗτοι μετὰ ταῦτα γαμήσαντες, ἔστωσαν ἐν τῇ ὑπηρεσίᾳ, διὰ τὸ ἐπιτραπῆναι αὐτοὺς ὑπό τοῦ ἐπισκόπου. Τοῦτο δὲ εἴ τινες σιωπήσαντες, καὶ καταδεξάμενοι ἐν τῇ χειροτονίᾳ μένειν οὕτως, μετὰ ταῦτα ἦλθον ἐπὶ γάμον, πεπαῦσθαι αὐτοὺς τῆς διακονίας. Can. Neocaesar. 1: Πρεσβύτερος ἐὰν γήμῃ, τῆς τάξεως φύτον μεταπέσθαι.

[16] According to Const. Ap. vi. 17, not ἑταίραν, ἢ οἰκέτιν, ἢ χήραν, ἢ ἐκβεβλημένην, as well as Levit. xxi. 7, 14. Ezeck. xliv. 22.

[17] So previously among the Gnostics. Irenaeus i. 1, § 12, says of some Valentinians: ὡς μετὰ ἀδελφῶν προσποιούμενοι συνοικεῖν, προϊόντος τοῦ χρόνου ἠλέγχθησαν, ἐγκύμονος τῆς ἀδελφῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ γενηθείσης. Perhaps also in the case of Marcion. See Hall. A. L. Z. April 1823. S. 850. Epiphanius, haer. 47, c. 3, accuses the Encratites of the same thing. The first trace of it among the Catholics is in Hermae pastor lib. iii. sim. ix. § 11, where the virgins say of Hermas: Nobiscum dormies ut frater, non ut maritus: frater enim noster es, et de caetero tecum habitare paratae sumus: valde enim carum te habemus, &c. Tertullian also, de jejuniis c. 17, appears to blame the Catholics for the

ductae, ἀγαπηταί, extraneae. Against this practice, which prevailed principally among the unmarried clergy, Cyprian first declared himself, and after him several synods.[19]

Hitherto the ascetics had lived scattered among other Christians without external distinction; but the Decian persecution was the cause of some Egyptian Christians[20] fleeing into the desert, and there in solitariness giving themselves up to an asceticism in the highest degree extravagant (ἐρημίται, μοναχοί). This new asceticism began to make greater noise, when, during Maximin's persecution (311), the hermit *Antonius*[21] appeared in a wild attire at Alexandria. But a season of persecution, which so readily engenders fanaticism, in addition to enthusiasm, was peculiarly adapted to procure approbation even for such oddities. Hence, Antony found imitators; and since the following time favoured such undertakings in another point of view, he was in the sequel regarded as the father of *Monachism*.[22]

same reason: apud te agape in cacabis fervet, fides in culinis calet, spes in ferculis jacet. Sed major his est agape, quia per hanc adolescentes tui cum sororibus dormiunt (an allusion to 1 Cor. xiii. 13). From the time of Cyprian the thing occurs more frequently. See below, note 19. Those ascetics appealed to the example of Jesus, John, and the apostles (Lib. de singularit. cleric. c. 20. Epiphan. haer. 78, c. 11), and named the young women after 1 Cor. ix. 5. Sorores (Conc. Ancyr. c. 19, Cod. Theodos. xvi. 2, 44). Comp. Observationum selectarum tom. vi. (Halae 1702) p. 230 ss. Dodwell diss. Cyprian. iii. L. A. Muratori anecdota graeca p. 218 ss. Heinichen ad Euseb. h. e. excurs. xiii. T. iii. p. 418 ss.

[18] Euseb. vii. 30, 6: τὰς συνεισάκτους γυναῖκας, ὡς Ἀντιοχεῖς ὀνομάζουσι. Perhaps the περιακτοί, 1 Cor. ix. 5, gave rise to that appellation proceeding from Antiochian wit. Perhaps, too, it originated from John xix. 27, ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν εἰς τὰ ἴδια i.e. συνεισήγαγεν.

[19] Cyprian. epist. 5, 6, especially 62. Can. Illib. 27, Ancyr. 19, Nicaen. 3. The two Syriac letters falsely attributed to Clement also censure this abuse (note 5). The later work, de singularitate clericorum, in opp. Cypriani, is directed entirely against the practice.

[20] Comp. Dionys. Alex. ap. Euseb. h. e. vi. 42.

[21] He lived on a rock in the rocky desert at the Red Sea, a day's journey from it. See vita S. Hilarionis by Jerome, Et. Quatremère mémoires géographiques et historiques sur l'Egypte. (Paris, 2 tomes, 1811) i. 152.

[22] Sozomenus h. e. i. 12, 13. Vita Antonii by Athanasius (either spurious or greatly interpolated, see Oudini comm. de scriptor. eccles. ant. vol. i. p. 358).

§ 74.

MORAL CHARACTER OF CHRISTIANITY IN THIS PERIOD.

Though Christian freedom at this time had been fettered only by a few ecclesiastical laws, and the teachers, for the most part, were still able rightly to distinguish the essence of Christian virtue from its forms, yet it cannot but be perceived, that germs were already developed in the church, from which its moral corruption afterwards arose. The notion of the church's external unity, with its consequences, led men to set too high a value on orthodoxy of the letter,[1] and on external connection with the church. Heretics were universally hated as men wholly corrupt and lost.[2] On the contrary, even an Origen was of opinion that, in the communion and at the intercession of the church, even wicked sinners might be accepted of God.[3] To this was added the error

[1] Origenes in Matth. commentar. series § 33: Et malum quidem est, invenire aliquem secundum mores vitae errantem, multo autem pejus arbitror esse in dogmatibus aberrare et non secundum verissimam regulam scripturarum sentire. Quoniam sicut in peccatis mortalibus, puniendi sumus amplius propter dogmata falsa peccantes.

[2] Orig. selecta in Job. ed. de la Rue p. 501: καὶ ὁ αἱρετικὸς ὅταν εὔξηται—ὅταν δοκῇ κατεστηρίχθαι, τότε εἰς τέλος ἀπολεῖται· ἡ γὰρ εὐχὴ αὐτοῦ λογίζεται αὐτῷ εἰς ἁμαρτίαν. Cyprian. de unit. eccles.: Tales etiamsi occisi in confessione nominis fuerint, macula ista nec sanguine abluitur. Esse martyr non potest, qui in ecclesia non est. Comp. the vota at the council of Carthage in the year 256 (in Cypriani opp. ed Baluz. p. 334 ss.): Lucius a Thebeste: Haereticos blasphemos atque iniquos—execrandos censeo. Vincentius a Thibari: Haereticos scimus esse pejores quam ethnicos. Lucianus a Rucuma: Si potest luci et tenebris convenire, potest nobis et haereticis aliquid esse commune. Heretics are called Const. Apost. vi. 13: ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται, καὶ ψευδαπόστολοι, πλάνοι καὶ φθορεῖς, ἀλωπέκων μερίδες καὶ χαμαιζήλων ἀμπελώνων ἀφανισταί. c. 18: οἱ διαφθείροντες τὸ ποίμνιον, καὶ μολύνοντες τὴν κληρονομίαν, οἱ δοξόσοφοι καὶ παμπόνηροι. Hence it was thought that heretics must have only the worst motives, and be guilty of the worst deeds. This was the source of so many distorted descriptions and fabrications respecting them.

[3] Origenes in libr. Jesu Nave hom. x. 1 on the narrative of the Gibeonites Jos. 9: Isti ergo veniunt ad Jesum cum omnibus vetustatibus suis, et orant ab eo hoc tantum ut salventur. In quorum figura tale mihi aliquid videtur ostendi. Sunt quidam in Ecclesia credentes quidem et habentes fidem in Deum, et acquiescentes in omnibus divinis praeceptis: quique etiam erga servos Dei religiosi sunt, et servire iis

of estimating many virtues as mistakes, too much according to external circumstances, while the temptation was easy to confound the ecclesiastical estimate of them,[4] which could only proceed upon the external form of the transactions, with the moral standard. The distinction between a higher and lower virtue did not indeed develope for a long time all the germs of corruption which it bore within itself; yet it must even already have perplexed the ideas of morality, since men began to place the higher virtue chiefly in certain external asceticism.[5] As too great value was attributed to this external asceticism, so also the stedfast endurance of persecution for the sake of Christianity was overvalued.[6] Although it is certain that many had worked themselves up to undergo martyrdom, from motives not wholly pure,[7] and although the confessors also were not always morally good men,[8] yet it was a general opinion that by the external

cupiunt, sed et ad ornatum Ecclesiae, vel ministerium satis promti paratique sunt, in actibus vero suis et conversatione propria obscoenitatibus et vitiis involuti, nec omnino deponentes veterem hominem cum actibus suis—praeter hoc, quod in Deum credunt, et erga servos Dei, vel Ecclesiae cultum videntur esse devoti, nihil adhibent emendationis vel innovationis in moribus. Istis ergo Jesus Dominus noster salutem quidem concedit, sed quodammodo salus ipsa eorum notam non evadit infamiae. Cf. c. 3. In Matthaeum commentariorum series c. 120 (ad Matth. xxvii. 15:) Illud quaeramus, si tale aliquid fiat et in judicio Dei, ut omnis Ecclesia petere possit aliquem peccatorem, ut solvatur a condemnatione peccati, maxime autem si quando habeat perditionis caetera opera, ad benefaciendum autem Ecclesiae impiger sit. Tales enim invenies saepe in potentibus constitutos, alias quidem peccatores, tamen pro Christianis, quantum possibile iis est, multa agentes. Hoc si videtur alicui dignum requisitione, requiret. Quod autem manifestum est, omnes curare tentemus, ut ex petentibus inveniamur esse, et in ordine eorum, qui bene vixerunt, magis quam ex illis, pro quibus petitur, quasi pro hominibus malis. Nam etsi concedatur aliquis peccatorum ad preces Ecclesiae, non tamen justum est gloriam et beatitudinem consequi eum, qui hujusmodi est: sufficit enim quod a poena dimittitur.

[4] Comp. especially the Canones Illiberitani, de Wette's Geschichte der christl. Sittenlehre. Erste Hälfte S. 176 ff.

[5] See § 73, note 11.

[6] De Wette l. c. S. 184 ff.

[7] Clem. strom. vii. p. 871: *οἱ μὲν γὰρ φιλοδοξίᾳ (ἐμμένουσιν ὁμολογίᾳ), οἱ δὲ εὐλαβείᾳ κολάσεως ἄλλης δριμυτέρας, οἱ δε διά τινας ἡδονὰς καὶ εὐφροσύνας τὰς μετὰ θάνατον ὑπομένοντες, παῖδες ἐν πίστει.* Comp. above § 72, note 26.

[8] Cyprian de unit. eccl.: Caeterum numquam in confessoribus fraudes et stupra et adulteria postmodum viderimus, quae nunc in quibusdam videntes ingemiscimus et dolemus. Epist. 7, ad Rogatianum presb.

fact of suffering, they not only blotted out their own sins before God, but were likewise able to atone for the sins of others.[9] Hence, the fanatical self-devotion to martyrdom (profiteri) always found admirers,[10] although it was disapproved by most.[11] On the other hand, in times of peace, many attached themselves to the church,[12] allured in part by external advantages, who were internally at a distance from it,[13] both regarding their relation to it as a thing simply external, and showing themselves lukewarm and indifferent.[14]

et caeteros confessores: Cum quanto enim nominis vestri pudore delinquitur, quando aliquis temulentus et lasciviens demoratur, alius in eam patriam; unde extorris factus est, regreditur, ut apprehensus non jam quasi Christianus sed quasi nocens pereat. Cf. epist. 6, ad Clerum suum.

[9] See above § 70. not. 15 ff.

[10] Comp. above § 53. not. 48. Euseb. de Martyr. Palaest. c. 3. eccl. vii. c. 12.

[11] Comp. § 53. not. 49. Cyprian. ep. 83. Petri Alex. epist. canon. c. 9. Mensurius, bishop of Carthage, see § 72. not. 26. Can. Illiberitan. c. 60: Si quis idola fregerit, et ibidem fuerit occisus, quatenus in evangelio scriptum non est, neque invenitur ab Apostolis unquam factum placuit in numero eum non recipi martyrum.

[12] Origenes c. Cels. i. p. 53: *τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ—ἐμποιεῖ θαυμασίαν τινὰ πραότητα, καὶ καταστολὴν τοῦ ἤθους, καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν, καὶ χρηστότητα, καὶ ἡμερότητα ἐν τοῖς μὴ διὰ τὰ βιωτικὰ ἢ τινας χρείας ἀνθρωπικὰς ὑποκριναμένοις, ἀλλὰ παραδεξαμένοις γνησίως τὸν περὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῆς ἐσομένης κρίσεως λόγον.*

[13] On the time before the Decian persecution Cyprianus de lapsis writes: Dominus probari familiam suam voluit, et quia traditam nobis divinitus disciplinam pax longa corruperat, jacentem fidem et paene dixerim dormientem censura coelestis erexit.—Studebant augendo patrimonio singuli, et—insatiabili cupiditatis ardore ampliandis facultatibus incubabant. Non in sacerdotibus religio devota, non in ministris fides integra, non in operibus misericordia, non in moribus disciplina.—Jungere cum infidelibus vinculum matrimonii, prostituere gentilibus membra Christi: non jurare tantum temere, sed adhuc etiam pejerare caet. Origenes in Jerem. hom. iv. 3: *Καὶ ἀληθῶς ἐὰν κρίνωμεν τὰ πράγματα ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ μὴ ὄχλοις,—ὀψόμεθα νῦν, ὡς οὐκ ἐσμὲν πιστοί· ἀλλὰ τότε ἦσαν πιστοί, ὅτε τὰ μαρτύρια τῇ γενεᾷ ἐγίνοντο κ. τ. λ.—Τότε ἦσαν πιστοὶ ὀλίγοι μὲν, πιστοὶ δὲ ἀληθῶς.—Νῦν δὲ, ὅτε γεγόναμεν πολλοί,—ἐκ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν ἐπαγγελλομένων θεοσέβειαν σφόδρα εἰσὶν ὀλίγοι, οἱ καταντῶντες ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκλογὴν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν μακαριότητα.* On the peaceful times before the Diocletian persecution Eusebii h. e. viii. 1: *ἄλλας ἐπ' ἄλλαις προσετιθεμεν κακίας.*

[14] Origenes in Gen. hom. x. 1: Ubi vel quando vestrum tempus inveniam (ad distribuendam in tempore tritici mensuram Luc. xii. 42)? Plurimum ex hoc, imo paene totum tempus mundanis occupationibus teritis in foro, aliud in negotiatione consumitis: alius agro, alius litibus vacat, et ad audiendum Dei verbum nemo, aut pauci admodum vacant. Sed quid vos de occupationibus culpo? Quid de absentibus conqueror?

While we cannot overlook these moral defects, we still find in the church a living Christianity prevailing, and in consequence thereof, fine moral phenomena which are sought for in vain out of its pale at this period.[15] In particular, that philanthropy which Christianity awakened in its professors, deserves so much the more honourable mention, as it was not confined merely to the Christian brethren,[16] but manifested itself in noble traits towards the heathen.[17]

Praesentes etiam et in Ecclesia positi non estis intenti, sed communes ex usu fabulas teritis, verbo Dei vel lectionibus divinis terga convertitis.—Sine intermissione orandum Apostolus praecipit. Vos, qui ad orationes non convenitis, quomodo impletis sine intermissione, quod semper omittitis?—quid faciunt hi, qui diebus tantum solemnibus ad Ecclesiam conveniunt? in Num. hom. xii. 2: Aliqui vestrum ut recitari audierint, quae leguntur, statim discedunt.—Alii ne hoc ipsum quidem patienter expectant, usque quo lectiones in Ecclesia recitentur. Alii vero nec si recitantur, sciunt, sed in remotioribus dominicae domus locis saecularibus fabulis occupantur. Hom. xiii. 3: Quanti modo hic praesentes sumus, et sermo Dei tractatur? Sunt, qui concipiunt corde, quae lecta sunt, sunt, qui omnino non concipiunt, quae dicuntur, sed est mens eorum et cor aut in negotiis, aut in actibus saeculi, aut supputationibus lucri: et praecipue mulieres quomodo, putas, corde concipiuut, quae tantum garriunt, quae tantum fabulis obstrepunt, ut non sinant esse silentium? Jam quid de mente earum, quid de corde discutiam, si de infantibus suis, aut de lana cogitent, aut de necessariis domus?

[15] Origines c. Celsum i. p. 21: Εἰ δ' ὁ εὐγνωμόνως ταῦτα κατανοῶν συγκαταθήσεται τῷ, μηδὲν κρεῖττον ἐν ἀνθρώποις γεγονέναι ἀθεεί· πόσῳ πλέον τὸ τοσοῦτον περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ θαῤῥῶν ἀποφανεῖται, συνεξετάζων πολλῶν προσερχομένων αὐτοῦ τῷ λόγῳ ἀρχαιοτέρους βίους μεταγενεστέροις, καὶ κατανοῶν, ἐν ὅσαις μὲν ἀκολασίαις, ὅσαις δὲ ἀδικίαις καὶ πλεονεξίαις ἕκαστος τῶνδε ἦν, πρίν, ὥς φησι Κέλσος,—ἀπατηθῶσι—ἐξ οὗ δὲ παρειλήφασι τὸν λόγον, τίνα τρόπον γεγόνασιν ἐπιεικέστεροι καὶ εὐσταθέστεροι; p. 50: Οἱ κατήγοροι τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ οὐχ ὁρῶσιν, ὅσων πάθη, καὶ ὅσων χύσις κακίας καταστέλλεται, καὶ ὅσων ἄγρια ἤθη ἡμεροῦται προφάσει τοῦ λόγου. Arnobius adv. gentes ii. 4: Nonne vel haec saltem fidem vobis faciunt argumenta credendi, quod jam per omnes terras in tam brevi temporis spatio immensi nominis hujus sacramenta diffusa sunt? quod nulla jam natio est tam barbari moris, et mansuetudinem nesciens, quae non ejus amore versa molliverit asperitatem suam, et in placidos sensus assumpta tranquillitate migraverit?

[16] Thus the Roman church, in the middle of the third century, had (Cornelius Ep. Rom. ap. Euseb. vi. 43, 5,) χήρας σὺν θλιβομένοις ὑπὲρ τὰς χιλίας πεντακοσίας, οὓς πάντας ἡ τοῦ δεσπότου χάρις καὶ φιλανθρωπία διατρέφει, and sent help besides even to the churches in Syria, Arabia, (see Dionys. Alex. b. Euseb. vii. 5, 1,) and Cappadocia (Basil. M. Ep. 70). Comp. above § 53, not. 9. Cyprian in exile ep. 36, ad clerum: Viduarum infirmorum et omnium pauperum curam peto diligenter habeatis. Sed et peregrinis, si qui indigentes fuerint, sumptus suggeratis de quantitate

mea propria, quam apud Rogatianum compresbyterum nostrum dimisi. Quae quantitas ne forte jam universa erogata sit, misi eidem—aliam portionem, ut largius et promptius circa laborantes fiat operatio. Epist. 60. He sends to the Numidian bishops to ransom the captive brethren from the barbarians, sestertia centum millia nummorum, which he had collected in his church. Et optamus quidem nihil tale de caetero fieri:—si tamen—tale aliquid acciderit, nolite cunctari nuntiare haec nobis literis vestris, pro certo habentes, ecclesiam nostram et fraternitatem istic universam ne haec ultra fiant precibus orare, si facta fuerint, libenter et largiter subsidia praestare. Epist. 61, ad Euchratium, bishop of Thenis, in reference to a converted actor who had been obliged to give up his employment: Quod si illic ecclesia non sufficit ad laborantibus praestet alimenta, poterit se ad nos transferre, et hic quod sibi ad victum atque ad vestitum necessarium fuerit accipere.

[17] Comp. Vita S. Cypriani per Pontium Diac. c. 9, on the conduct of Cyprian and his church on occasion of a desolating plague: Aggregatam primo in loco uno plebem de misericordiae bonis instituit, docens divinae lectionis exemplis, quantum ad promerendum Deum prosint officia pietatis. Tunc deinde subjungit, non esse mirabile, si nostros tantum debito caritatis obsequio foveremus: eum perfectum posse fieri, qui plus aliquid publicano vel ethnico fecerit: qui malum bono vincens, et divinae clementiae instar exercens, inimicos quoque dilexerit: qui pro persequentium se salute, sicuti, Dominus monet et horatur, orarit. Oriri Deus facit jugiter solem suum, et pluvias subinde nutriendis seminibus impertit, exhibens cuncta ista non suis tantum, sed etiam alienis; et qui se Dei etiam filium esse profitetur, cur non exemplum patris imitatur? Respondere, inquit, nos decet natalibus nostris, et quos renatos per Deum constat, degeneres esse non congruit; sed probare potius in sobole traducem boni patris aemulatione bonitatis. Cap. 10: Multa alia, et quidem magna praetereo.—Quod si illa gentiles pro rostris audire potuissent, forsitan statim crederent. Quid christiana plebs faceret, cui de fide nomen est? Distributa sunt ergo continuo pro qualitate hominum atque ordinum ministeria. Multi qui angustia paupertatis beneficia sumtus exhibere non poterant, plus sumtibus exhibebant, compensantes proprio labore mercedem divitiis omnibus cariorem.—Fiebat itaque exuberantium operum largitate, quod bonum est ad omnes, non ad solos domesticos fidei etc. Dionysius Alex. ap. Euseb. vii. c. 22, gives a similar account of the conduct of the Alexandrian Christians at the time of a pestilence. Among other things, *οἱ γοῦν πλεῖστοι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν δι' ὑπερβάλλουσαν ἀγάπην καὶ φιλαδελφίαν ἀφειδοῦντες ἑαυτῶν καὶ ἀλλήλων ἐχόμενοι, ἐπισκοποῦντες ἀφυλάκτως τοὺς νοσοῦντας, λιπαρῶς ὑπηρετούμενοι, θεραπεύοντες ἐν Χριστῷ, συναπηλλάττοντο ἐκείνοις ἀσμενέστατα τοῦ παρ' ἑτέρων ἀναπιμπλάμενοι πάθους, καὶ τὴν νόσον ἐφ' ἑαυτοὺς ἕλκοντες ἀπὸ τῶν πλησίον, καὶ ἑκόντες ἀναμασσόμενοι τὰς ἀλγηδόνας.—Τὰ δέ γε ἔθνη τῶν τοὐναντίον. καὶ νοσεῖν ἀρχομένους ἀπωθοῦντο, καὶ ἀπέφευγον τοὺς φιλτάτους, κἂν ταῖς ὁδοῖς ἐῤῥίπτουν ἡμιθνῆτας· καὶ νεκροὺς ἀτάφους ἀπεσκυβαλίζοντο, τὴν τοῦ θανάτου διάδοσιν καὶ κοινωνίαν ἐκτρεπόμενοι.*

SECOND PERIOD.

FROM CONSTANTINE TO THE BEGINNING OF THE CONTROVERSIES CONCERNING IMAGE WORSHIP. A.D. 324—726.

For the general history of the middle ages: Ed. Gibbon, history of the decline and fall of the Roman empire, London 1776—88. 4to. Translated into German with remarks, by F. A. W. Wenk, K. G. Schreiber, and Ch. D. Beck. Leipz. 1788—1807. 19 Theile 8vo,—F. Ch. Schlosser's Weltgeschichte in zusammenhängender Erzahlung. Frankf. a. M. 1815 ff. 8. from the second volume onward. Fr. Rehm's Handbuch d. Geschichte des Mittelalters, 4 Bde. Marburg 1821—39. 8. H. Leo's Lehrbuch der. Gesch. des Mittelalters 2 Theile. Halle 1830. 8.

FIRST DIVISION.

TO THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON. A.D. 324—421.

SOURCES.

1. Greek ecclesiastical historians: The continuators of Eusebius: Socrates scholasticus, of Constantinople, hist. eccl. libb. vii. from 306—439. Hermias Sozomenus, lawyer in Constantinople, hist. eccl. libb. ix. 323—423. (Both edited by H. Valesius. Paris, 1668. Mogunt. 1677. Amst. 1700. fol.) Theodoretus, bishop of Cyprus, hist. eccl. libb. v. 322—429. (in Theodoreti opp. ed. Jac. Sirmondus. Paris. 1642 ss. fol. Tom. 3, p. 2.—in edit. Schulzii aura J. A. Noesselt, T. 3, p. 719 ss. Halae 1771. 8.)[1] The Arian Philostorgius, hist. eccl. libb. xii. 318—425. (preserved only in the extracts of Photius, cod. 40. ed. Jac. Gothofredus. Genev. 1643, 4.)

Farther continuators: Theodorus Lector in Constantinople made extracts from Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, in

[1] F. A. Holzhausen comm. de fontibus, quibus Socrates, Sozomenus, ac Theodoretus in scribenda historia sacra usi sunt, adjuncta eorum epicrisi. Gotting. 1825. 4.

2 books, and continued the history in 2 books more till A.D. 518. (Fragments of the continuation have been preserved chiefly in Nicephorus Callistus, who, about 1330, compiled a church history in 23 books down to 911, of which history the first 18 books, reaching to 610, are extant. Ed. Fronto Ducaeus, Paris. 1630. 2 voll. fol. Old and new fragments in J. A. Cramer anecdota Graeca, e Codd. Paris. Oxon. 1839. ii. 101.) Evagrius Scholasticus in Antioch, hist. eccl. libb. vi. von 431—594.[2] Editions. Theodoreti et Evagrii Schol. hist. eccl. item excerpta ex historiis Philostorgii et Theodori Lectoris, ed. H. Valesius. Paris. 1673. Mogunt. 1679. Amst. 1695. fol.—Eusebii Pamphili, Socratis Schol., Herm. Sozomeni, Theodoreti et Evagrii, item Philostorgii et Theodori Lectoris, quae exstant graece et latine. H. Valesius emendavit, latine vertit, et annotationibus illustravit: criticis plurium eruditorum observationibus locupletavit Guil. Reading. Cantabrig. 1720. 3 T. fol. (a faulty edition, August. Taurin. 1747.)

Chronicon Paschale (falsely called Alexandrinum) from the creation of the world to 628, ed. Car. du Fresne Dom. du Cange. Paris, 1688. fol. ad exemplar vatic. rec. L. Dindorfius voll. ii. Bonnae 1832, 8.[3]

2. Latin ecclesiastical historians: Severus Sulpicius, presbyter in the diocese of Agen, histor. sacra libb. ii. a mundo cond.—400. p. C. (opp. ed. Jo. Clericus. Lips. 1709. 8. Hieron. de Prato, Veron. 1741. 44. 2 voll. 4.) Rufinus, presbyter in Aquileia, translated Eusebius in 9 books, and continued the history in 2 books, to 395 (Socrates h. e. ii, 1, pronounces a judgment on the continuation.) ed. P. Th. Cacciari. Romae 1740. 41. 4.—Historia tripartita libb. xii. compiled by Cassiodorus and Epiphanius Scholasticus, about 550, from Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. This, and Rufinus's church history were the historical sources for

[2] G. Dangers comm. de fontibus, indole et dignitate librorum, quos de hist. eccl. scripserunt Theodorus Lector et Evagrius. Gottingae 1841. 4.

[3] According to the opinion which originated with Luc. Holstenius (ed. Bonn, ii. 16), the proper Chron. Pasch. reaches only to 314, while the following part belongs to a later continuator. But even in that first part we find very many allusions to later persons and things, so that it must have suffered a thorough interpolation. For example, the festival of the annunciation is mentioned, i. 373; Chrysostom, and under this very name too, 437; Eutyches, 445; Cyrillus, 450, &c.

the middle ages; published together by Beatus Rhenanus, Basil, 1523, and frequently in the 16th century.

Hieronymi de viris illustribus lib. (written 392) and the continuation under the same title by Gennadius (about 495), both in J. A. Fabricii bibliotheca ecclesiastica. Hamb. 1718. fol.

3. Latin chronicles: Jerome translated the chronicon of Eusebius into Latin, and continued it to 379 (in Eusebii chron. ed. Jos. Scaliger, Lugd. Bat. 1606 and Amstelod. 1658. fol.) After him we have in succession the chronicles of Prosper of Aquitania to 455 (444?), of the Spanish bishop Idatius, to 469, and of Marcellinus Comes, to 534. The contents of these chronicles are arranged according to years, from 379 till 455, and published in Chronica medii aevi post Eusebium atque Hieron. res saec. iv. v. et vi. exponentia. ed. Chr. F. Roesler. T. 1. Tubingae 1798. 8.
4. Acts of councils in the Collect. Concill. The canons of the councils in H. Th. Bruns biblioth. eccles. vol. i. (Canones Apostol. et Concill. saec. iv—vii. in 2 Part.) Berolini 1839. 8. G. D. Fuch's library of the ecclesiastical councils of the fourth and fifth centuries. Leipz. 1780—84. 4 parts, 8vo. Synodicon vetus, a short account of the councils up to the year 869, prim. ed. Jo. Pappus. Argent. 1601. 4. also in G. Voelli et H. Justelli bibl. juris canon. veteris T. ii. p. 1166 ss. and in Fabricii bibl. graeca vol. xi. p. 185. ed. nov. vol. xii. p. 360 ss. belongs here from cap. 34—90.
5. Imperial decrees: Codex Theodosianus (compiled in 438, partly lost) cum comm. Jac. Gothofredi, cur. Jo. Dan. Ritter, Lips. 1737 ss. 6 voll. fol. with the recently found books and fragments edited by G. Haenel Bonnae 1842. 4.—Codex Justinianeus compiled by Tribonianus in 529, codex repetitae praelectionis 534 (in the numerous editions of the Corpus juris civilis.)
6. Heathen historians: Ammianus Marcellinus, rerum gestarum libb. xxxi. only libb. 14—31 are extant (from the year 353—378) ed. Jac. Gronov. Lugd. Bat. 1693. fol. J. A. Ernesti. Lips. 1773. 8.—Zosimus, ἱστορία νέα libb. vi. (to 410,) ed. Chr. Cellarius. Cizae 1679. 8. J. F. Reitemeier. Lips. 1784. 8.[4]

[4] There are different opinions concerning the historical value of

FIRST CHAPTER.

STRUGGLE BETWEEN CHRISTIANITY AND PAGANISM.

J. G. Hoffmann ruina superstitionis paganae variis observatt. ex. historia eccl. saec. iv. et. v. illustrata. Vitemb. 1738. 4. S. Th. Rüdiger de statu et conditione paganorum sub. Impp. christianis post Constantinum. Vratislav. 1815. 8. Histoire de la destruction du Paganisme en Occident par A. Beugnot. 2 Tomes. Paris 1835. 8. (a Prize Essay.)

§ 75.

THE BENEFITS BELONGING TO CHRISTIANITY UNDER CONSTANTINE AND HIS SONS.

Martini über die Einführung der christl. Religion als Staatsrelig. im röm. Reiche durch d. Kaiser Constantin. München 1813. 4. S. 29 ff.

Although Constantine, after his victory over Licinius, gave full toleration to all religions,[1] protected the heathen priests in their prerogatives,[2] reserved to himself the dignity of a pontifex maximus,[3] and not till shortly before his death († 337) received the rite of baptism from Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia;[4] yet he openly professed Christianity immediately after that victory,[5] seeking to make it more acceptable to his subjects by recon-

Zosimus's history. It is very favourably judged by Jo. Leunclavius (Apologia pro Zosimo in his Romanae hist. scriptt. minores. Francof. 1590. fol. reprinted in the edition of Cellarius) and Reitemeier (disquis. de Zosimo prefixed to his edition): quite unfavourable is the judgment of the older church historians, and of Guil. de Sainte-Croix observations sur Zosime in his Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscriptions T. 49 (1808) p. 466 ss.

[1] Eusebius de vit. Const. ii. 56, 60.

[2] Cod. Theodos. xii. i. 21 A.D. 335 and xii. v. 2 A.D. 337.

[3] See below § 78. not. 2. Constantine appears on many coins with the insignia of the pontifex maximus, see Mionnet de la rareté et du prix des medailles romaines (Paris 1827. 2 vol. 8.) ii. 236.

[4] Eusebius de vita Const. iv. c. 61. 62.

[5] When later heathens asserted (Juliani Caesares at the conclusion, Zosimus ii. 29. Zozomen i. 5) that a conscience, troubled on account of the murder of his son Crispus, and his wife Fausta, impelled the emperor to Christianity, which was the only religion that promised full forgiveness of sin, even chronology is against the assertion. Comp. Man-

mendation and persuasion,[6] and attractive towards the Christians by favours;[7] engaging with zeal in the erection of many, and in part, splendid churches,[8] and in furnishing them with revenues out of the common fund of the cities.[9] Since paganism

so's Leben Constantins d. G. Breslau 1817. 8. S. 119. Hug's Denkschrift zur Ehrenrettung Constantins d. G. in d. Zeitschrift f. d. Geistlichkeit des Erzbisth. Freiburg. Heft 3. S. 75 ff.

[6] See his rescripts to the oriental provinces in Euseb. de vita Const. ii. 24—42. 48—60. Respecting his speeches in recommendation of Christianity cf. iv. 29. 32, 55. The one which he wrote, ὃν ἔγραψε τῷ τῶν ἁγίων συλλόγῳ, is appended to Eusebius's life of him. In it he lays peculiar stress on the prophecies of the sybil, and the fourth eclogue of Virgil, which he also refers to Christ.

[7] Euseb. de vita Const. iv. 28: Ταῖς δ' ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ θεοῦ καθ' ὑπεροχὴν ἐξαίρετον πλεῖσθ' ὅσα παρεῖχεν· ὧδε μὲν ἀγρούς, ἀλλαχόθι δὲ σιτοδοσίας, ἐπὶ χορηγίᾳ πενήτων ἀνδρῶν, παίδων τ' ὀρφανῶν κ. τ. λ. Comp. the emperor's direction to the bishops, how they should use the new means put into their hands for the conversion of the heathen l. c. iii. c. 21: οἱ μὲν γὰρ ὡς πρὸς τροφὴν χαίρουσιν ἐπικαιρούμενοι· οἱ δὲ τῆς προστασίας ὑποτρέχειν εἰώθασιν· ἄλλοι τοὺς δεξιώσεσι φιλοφρονουμένους ἀσπάζονται· καὶ ξενίοις τιμώμενοι ἀγαπῶσιν ἕτεροι· βραχεῖς δ' οἱ λόγων ἀληθεῖς ἐρασταί, καὶ σπάνιος αὖ ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας φίλος. Διὸ πρὸς πάντας ἁρμόττεσθαι δεῖ, ἰατροῦ δίκην ἑκάστῳ τὰ λυσιτελῆ πρὸς σωτηρίαν πορίζομένους· ὥστ' ἐξ ἅπαντος τὴν σωτήριον παρὰ τοῖς πᾶσι δοξάζεσθαι διδασκαλίαν. In this way he himself converted the pagan inhabitants of Heliopolis in Phoenicia, l. c. iii. 58: προνοῶν,—ὅπως ἂν πλείους προσοίσειν τῷ λόγῳ, τὰ πρὸς ἐπικουρίαν τῶν πενήτων ἔκπλεα παρεῖχε, καὶ ταύτῃ προτρέπων ἐπὶ τὴν σωτήριον σπεύδειν διδασκαλίαν· μονονουχὶ τῷ φάντι παραπλησίως εἰπὼν ἂν καὶ αὐτός· "εἴτε προφάσει, εἴτ' ἀληθείᾳ Χριστὸς καταγγελλέσθω (Phil. i. 18!)." Rewards bestowed on the places which declared in favour of Christianity, l. c. iv. 38 and 39.

[8] See his letter to all bishops, Euseb. de vit. Const. ii. 46, in which he directs them, σπουδάζειν περὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν· καὶ ἢ ἐπανορθοῦσθαι τὰ ὄντα, ἢ εἰς μείζονα αὔξειν, ἢ ἔνθα ἂν χρεία ἀπαιτῇ, καινὰ ποιεῖν. Αἰτήσεις δὲ—τὰ ἀναγκαῖα παρά τε τῶν ἡγεμόνων, καὶ τῆς ἐπαρχικῆς τάξεως. τούτοις γὰρ ἐπεστάλθη, πάσῃ προθυμίᾳ ἐξυπηρετήσασθαι τοῖς ὑπὸ τῆς σῆς ὁσιότητος λεγομένοις. On the rescripts to the Praesides Prov. see ii. 45.—Churches which Constantine himself caused to be built: one at the holy sepulchre in Jerusalem (τὸ Μαρτύριον· ἡ ἐκκλησία τῆς τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἀνάστάσεως, built from 326—335. Euseb. l. c. iii, 25—40; iv. 43—45. Comp. E. F. Wernsdorfi hist. templi Constantiniani propter resurrectionis Christi locum exstructi, and De templi Constantiniani etc. sollemni dedicatione. Viteberg. 1770. 4.), on the Mount of Olives and in Bethlehem (both built by Helena l. c. iii. 41—43), in Nicomedia and Antioch (iii. 50), in Mambre (iii. 51), in Heliopolis (iii. 58), many churches in Constantinople (iii. 48), especially the church of the apostles (iv. 58—60). Cf. Jo. Ciampinus de sacris aedificiis a Const. M. exstructis. Romae 1693. fol.

[9] Sozomenus i. c. 8: ἐκ δὲ τῆς οὔσης ὑποφόρου γῆς καθ' ἑκάστην πόλιν ἐξελὼν τοῦ δημοσίου ἑητὸν τέλος, ταῖς κατὰ τόπον ἐκκλησίαις καὶ κλήροις ἀπέ-

continued to prevail in Rome,[10] he transferred the seat of his government to Byzantium, and changed this city into a chiefly Christian *New-Rome*, (afterwards Constantinople).[11] But yet the greater number of the principal families of the kingdom remained heathen still, and hence, he was obliged to have many heathens about his person, and in the higher offices of state,[12] although he most readily advanced Christians to posts of honour.[13] The more violent measures of Constantine against paganism were confined to his confiscating in the east many less frequented temples, whose revenues he converted to the use of Christian churches, or the building of Constantinople,[14] and his prohibiting the rites of worship connected with immoralities.[15]

νειμε, καὶ τὴν δωρεὰν εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον κυρίαν εἶναι ἐνομοθέτησε. v. c. 5: *ἐκ τῶν ἑκάστης πόλεως φόρων τὰ ἀρκοῦντα* (shortly before it is called *τὰ σιτηρέσια*, ap. Theodoret. iv. 4: *σύνταξις σίτου*) *πρὸς παρασκευὴν ἐπιτηδείων ἀπένειμε τοῖς πανταχοῦ κλήροις.* The unfortunate consequences of these measures and the exemption of the clergy, on the state of municipal affairs are shown by F. Roth de re municipali Romanorum libb. ii. Stuttg. 1801. p. 32 ss. Hegewisch hist. Versuch über d. röm. Finanzen. Altona 1804. S. 324 ff.

[10] In the year 331 the temple of Concordia was restored by the senate. The erection, also, of several altars happened at this time. Comp. Beugnot hist. de la destruction du Paganisme i. 106.

[11] Euseb. de vita Const. iii. 48. *τὴν πόλιν—καθαρεύειν εἰδωλολατρίας ἁπάσης ἐδικαίου· ὡς μηδαμοῦ φαίνεσθαι ἐν αὐτῇ τῶν νομιζομένων θεῶν ἀγάλματα ἐν ἱεροῖς θρησκευόμενα, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ βωμοὺς λύθροις αἱμάτων μιαινομένους, οὐ θυσίας ὁλοκαυτουμένας πυρί, οὐ δαιμονικὰς ἑορτάς, οὐδ' ἕτερον τι τῶν συνήθων τοῖς δεισιδαίμοσιν.* Constantine besides beautified his new city with works of art, even with statues of the gods, which were everywhere pillaged and brought away together. The *ναοί δύο*, with the images of Rhea and the Fortuna Romae ap. Zosimus ii. 31, were probably only niches. When Constantine caused his gilded statue to be set up at the dedication of the city, with the *Τύχη τῆς πόλεως* on the right, which was to be honoured at the yearly festival of the birth-day of the existing emperor (Chron. paschale p. 285): this merely proves that as yet no suitable Christian symbolism had been formed for such solemnities (comp. Manso l. c. S. 77). It is an analogous case when we find frequently on the coins of the first Christian emperors Victoria with the Labarum. The later tradition (ap. Zonaras, Cedrenus, &c.), that Constantine dedicated his city to the mother of God, is ridiculous.

[12] Euseb. l. c. ii. 44: *τοῖς κατ' ἐπαρχίας διῃρημένοις ἔθνεσιν ἡγεμόνας κατέπεμπε, τῇ σωτηρίῳ πίστει καθωσιωμένους τοὺς πλείους· ὅσοι δ' ἑλληνίζειν ἐδόκουν, τούτοις θύειν ἀπείρητο* (cf. iv. 52).

[13] Cf. Rüdiger de statu et conditione Paganorum p. 14 ss.

[14] Euseb. l. c. iii. 54. Libanius in several passages (see below, note 16). Martini S. 38. Rüdiger p. 21 ss.

[15] So the worship of Venus in Phoenicia, Euseb. l. c. iii. 55, 58, iv.

The law by which he is said to have interdicted all sacrifices was not at least carried out into operation.[16] After his death he was, according to custom, placed by the senate among the gods.[17]

After the death of *Constantine II.* († 340) *Constantius* ruled the east, and *Constans* the west. Both declared themselves decided opponents to paganism.[18] *Constans*, however, could not proceed very strictly in opposition to it in the west, but had to act with some respect towards Rome in particular, still addicted as it was to the monuments of the ancient religion.[19] But under

37, 38, the scandalous worship of the Nile, iv. 25. So also he threw down the temple of Exculopius in Cilicia, on account of the fraud carried on there, iii. 56. Martini S. 36 f. Rüdiger p. 23 ss.

[16] As Constantius (below note 18) refers to such a law, so Eusebius l. c. ii. 45 speaks expressly of a *νόμος εἴργων τὰ μυσαρὰ τῆς—εἰδωλολατρίας, ὡς μήτε ἐγέρσεις ξοάνων ποιεῖσθαι τολμᾷν, μήτε μαντείαις καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις περιεργίαις ἐπιχειρεῖν, μήτε μὴν θύειν καθόλου μηδένα.* In like manner iv. 23. 25. and the following Christian writers, the later of whom, ex. gr. Theophanes, speak even of capital punishments which Constantine enacted against heathenism. See Martini p. 34. Annot. 67. On the other hand, it is striking that this law is nowhere to be found, and that only expressions of his are extant, which give toleration to heathenism (see note 1), and that Libanius asserts of him Orat. pro templis § 3. (ed. Reiske vol. ii. p. 161): *εἰς μὲν τὴν τῆς πόλεως, περὶ ἣν ἐσπούδασε, ποίησιν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἐχρήσατο χρήμασι, τῆς κατὰ νόμους δὲ θεραπείας ἐκίνησεν οὐδὲ ἕν.* According to Gothofredus (ad Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. 10. l. 3) such a law was actually passed, but in the last years of the emperor. Martini, p. 40, is of opinion that Constantine and Eusebius in those passages refer merely to the laws against immoral rites: Rüdiger thinks that a general prohibition of sacrifice was issued by Constantine, but afterwards recalled. Perhaps it was published shortly before his death, and was not therefore carried into execution.

[17] Eutropii breviarium x. 4: inter Divos meruit referri. There is still a calendar existing in which the festivals instituted in honour of him are enumerated. See de la Bastie in the Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscr. xv. 106. Beugnot hist. de la destruction du Paganisme i. 109.

[18] Cod. Theodos. lib. xvi. tit. 10. l. 2. (A.D. 341): Cesset superstitio, sacrificiorum aboleatur insania. Nam quicunque contra legem divi principis parentis nostri, et hanc nostrae mansuetudinis jussionem ausus fuerit sacrificia celebrare, competens in eum vindicta et praesens sententia exseratur.

[19] Cod. Theod. xvi. 10, 3, ad Catullinum Praef. Urbi (A.D. 342): Quamquam omnis superstitio penitus eruenda sit, tamen volumus, ut aedes templorum, quae extra muros sunt positae, intactae incorruptaeque consistant. Nam cum ex nonnullis vel ludorum, vel circensium, vel agonum origo fuerit exorta, non convenit ea convelli, ex quibus populo Romano praebeatur priscarum solennitas voluptatum. About 347 an unknown

these emperors the Christians sometimes forgot the principles of religious toleration on which they had so loudly insisted during former persecutions,[20] and fanatical voices calling for the violent extinction of paganism were raised among them.[21] When the whole empire devolved on Constantius after Constans' death († 350), all sacrifices were prohibited for the first time on pain of death.[22] This law could not however be fully carried out in Rome and Alexandria.[23] Everywhere else heathenism from this

traveller (Vetus Orbis descriptio ed. J. Gothofredi. 1628. p. 35) found in Rome not only seven Vestal virgins, but the worship of Jupiter, Sol, and the Mater Deum still entire. Comp. Gothofredi not. p. 40 ss. Testimonies respecting the Pagan worship at this time may be derived from inscriptions in Beugnot hist. de la destruction du Paganisme i. 154.

[20] For example, Justin. apol. maj. c. 2, 4, 12. Tertull. ad Scapulam c. 2. So also as yet even under Constantine Lactant. institt. v. 19: religio cogi non potest: verbis potius quam verberibus res agenda est, ut sit voluntas. Nihil est tam voluntarium, quam religio. c. 20: nos non expetimus, ut Deum nostrum, qui est omium, velint nolint, colat aliquis invitus: nec, si non coluerit, irascimur. Epitome c. 24: Religio sola est, in qua libertas domicilium collocavit. Res est enim praeter caeteras voluntaria, nec imponi cuiquam necessitas potest, ut colat quod non vult. Potest aliquis forsitan simulare, non potest velle.

[21] Julius Firmicus Maternus lib. de errore profanarum religionum, dedicated to the two emperors between 340 and 350 (ed. F. Münter. Havn. 1826. 8. p. 118). Among other things it is said: Vobis, sacratissimi Imperatores, ad vindicandum et puniendum hoc malum necessitas imperatur, et hoc vobis Dei summi lege praecipitur, ut severitas vestra idololatriae facinus omnifariam persequatur. Audite et commendate sanctis sensibus vestris, quid de isto facinore Deus jubeat. (Here follows: Deut. xiii. 6—10. Then it is added:) Nec filio jubet parci, nec fratri, et per amatam conjugem gladium vindicem ducit. Amicum quoque sublimi severitate persequitur, et ad discerpenda sacrilegorum corpora omnis populus armatur. Integris etiam civitatibus, si in isto fuerint facinore deprehensae, decernuntur excidia: et ut hoc Providentia Vestra manifestius discat, constitutae legis sententiam proferam etc.

[22] Cod. Theod. xvi. 10, 4, (A.D. 353): Placuit, omnibus locis atque urbibus universis claudi protinus templa, et accessu vetitis omnibus, licentiam delinquendi perditis abnegari. Volumus etiam, cunctos sacrificiis abstinere. Quodsi quis aliquid forte hujusmodi perpetraverit, gladio ultore sternatur. Facultates etiam perempti fisco decernimus vindicari, et similiter affligi rectores provinciarum, si facinora vindicare neglexerint. Comp. L. 5, (A.D. 353,) and L. 6, (A.D. 356). However, the heathen priesthood were restored in cases of vacancy, xii. 1, 46, (A.D. 358).—A prohibition of the adoption of Judaism, Cod. Th. xvi. 8, 7, (A.D. 357): Si quis, lege venerabili constituta, ex Christiano Judaeus effectus sacrilegis coetibus aggregetur, cum accusatio fuerit comprobata, facultates ejus dominio fisci jussimus vindicari.

[23] The prefects of the city at this time were heathen. See Rüdiger

time forward was obliged to conceal itself in the country, in remote corners[24] (hence Pagani, Paganismus).[25] Constantius died in 361.

These violent measures had certainly the effect of opening the eyes of the heathen people to the impotency of their gods and the fraud of their priests;[26] but with nobler patriotic spirits they tended rather to increase the prejudices against Christianity, so partial as it appeared to be, and favoured by measures so unjust. Whatever truth they discovered in it appeared to them to have been already taught by the ancient philosophers.[27] They regarded

p. 31 s.—Symmachus lib. x. ep. 61, (also in Opp. S. Ambrosii ed. Benedict. t. iii. p. 872. Comp. the remarks of the Benedictine editor) says with reference to the presence of Constantius in Rome in the year 357: Nihil decerpsit sacrarum virginum privilegiis, decrevit nobilibus sacerdotia, Romanis caeremoniis non negavit impensas, et per omnes vias aeternae urbis laetum secutus senatum, vidit placido ore delubra, legit inscripta fastigiis deum nomina, percontatus est templorum origines, miratus est conditores. Cumque alias religiones ipse sequeretur, has servavit imperio. A calendar of the year 354, (in Graevii thes. antiqu. rom. viii. 95,) gives all the heathen festivals as constantly observed.

[24] Especially on account of the spies which now appeared, curiosi, see Valesius ad Ammian. Marc. xv. 3, 8.

[25] The expression is first found in a law of Valentinian A.D. 368, (Cod. Theodos. lib. xvi. tit. 2, l. 18,) and about the same time in Marius Victorinus de *ὁμοουσίῳ* recipiendo (Graeci, quos Ἕλληνας vel Paganos vocant, multos Deos dicunt), and in his Comm. in Ep. ad Galatas in A. Maji scriptt. vett. nova collectio T. iii. P. ii. p. 29. Under Theodosius this name is the usual one. For the explanation of it see Paulus Orosius (about 416) histor. praef. qui ex locorum agrestium compitis et pagis pagani vocantur. Prudentius (about 405) has for it Peristeph. x. 296: pago dediti; in Symmachum i. 620: pago impliciti cf. Severi Sancti Endelechii (about 400) carmen de mortibus boum v. 105: Signum, quod perhibent esse crucis Dei, magnis qui colitur solus in urbibus. See T. Flav. Clementis hymn. in Christum servatorem. Sev. Sancti Endel. carmen bucol. de mortibus boum ed. F. Piper (Gottingae 1835. 8.) p. 85.

[26] Eusebius de vita Const. iii. 57: *πάντες δ' οἱ πρὶν δεσιδαίμονες, τὸν ἔλεγχον τῆς αὐτῶν πλάνης αὐταῖς ὄψεσιν ὁρῶντες, τῶν δ' ἁπανταχοῦ νεῶν τε καὶ ἱδρυμάτων ἔργῳ θεώμενοι τὴν ἐρημίαν, οἱ μὲν τῷ σωτηρίῳ προσέφευγον λόγῳ οἱ δ', εἰ καὶ τοῦτο μὴ ἔπραττον, τῆς γοῦν πατρῴας κατεγίνωσκον ματαιότητος, ἐγέλων τε καὶ κατεγέλων τῶν πάλαι νομιζομένων αὐτοῖς θεῶν.*

[27] Augustinus Ep. 34 mentions libros beatissimi Papae Ambrosii,—quos adversus nonnullos imperitissimos et superbissimos, qui de Platonis libris Dominum profecisse contendunt, (de doctr. christ. ii. 43: qui dicere ausi sunt, omnes Domini nostri J. Chr. sententias, quas mirari et praedicare coguntur, de Platonis libris eum didicisse) diligentissime et copiosissime scripsit.

the positive doctrines of it as foreign superstitions, while the theological controversies concerning these doctrines brought suspicion on Christianity, and turned its professors into ridicule.[28] On the other hand, paganism gained in this respect, that the ancient classic science and literature, containing a religious doctrine at once pure and national, seemed chiefly to belong to it and to be entrusted to its keeping.[29] The most celebrated schools of rhetoric and philosophy in Alexandria, Athens,[30] &c., had heathen preceptors. The new platonic philosophy was silently working in favour of paganism.[31] *Jamblichus* († 333), the great orators *Libanius* († 395), *Himerius* († 390), and *Themistius* († 390), were heathen;[32] while there were few Christian scholars who could rival them, like the two *Apollinaris* in Laodicea in Syria; and these had to struggle with the prejudices against all heathen learning which were increased by monachism.[33] Thus the

[28] Euseb. de vita Constant. ii. c. 61. *εἰς τοσοῦτον δὴ ἤλαυνεν ἀτοπίας ἡ τῶν γινομένων θέα, ὥστ' ἤδη ἐν αὐτοῖς μέσοις τῶν ἀπίστων θεάτροις τὰ σεμνὰ τῆς ἐνθέου διδασκαλίας τὴν αἰσχίστην ὑπομένειν χλεύην.* Gregor. Naz. Orat. i. p. 34: *μισούμεθα ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι—ἃ κατ' ἀλλήλων ἐπινοοῦμεν, κατὰ πάντων ἔχουσι· καὶ γεγόναμεν θέατρον καινὸν—πᾶσι μικροῦ τοῖς πονηροῖς, καὶ ἐπὶ παντὸς καιροῦ καὶ τόπου, ἐν ἀγοραῖς, ἐν πότοις.—ἤδη δὴ προήλθομεν καὶ μέχρι τῆς σκηνῆς,—καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἀσελγεστάτων γελώμεθα, καὶ οὐδὲν οὕτω τερπνὸν τῶν ἀκουσμάτων καὶ θεαμάτων, ὡς Χριστιανὸς κωμῳδούμενος, ταῦτα ἡμῖν ὁ πρὸς ἀλλήλους πόλεμος κ. τ. λ.*

[29] Libanius in his Apologeticus, ed. Reiske vol. iii. p. 437, dates from the persecution of heathenism by Constantine *τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν ἐπὶ τοὺς λόγους ἀτιμίαν.—οἰκεῖα γάρ, οἶμαι, καὶ συγγενῆ ταῦτα ἀμφότερα, ἱερα καὶ λόγοι.*

[30] Respecting them see Schlosser in his Archive für Geschichte und Literatur Bd. I. (Frankf. a. M. 1830,) S. 217. On the school at Athens see Ullmann's Gregorius von Nazianz (Darmstadt 1825) S. 27 ff. Gregorii Nazianz Orat. xx. p. 331, (ed. Bened. Orat. xliii. p. 787): *βλαβεραὶ μὲν—Ἀθῆναι, τὰ εἰς ψυχήν· καὶ γὰρ πλουτοῦσι τὸν κακὸν πλοῦτον, τὰ εἴδωλα, μᾶλλον τῆς ἄλλης Ἑλλάδος, καὶ χαλεπὸν μὴ συναρπασθῆναι τοῖς τούτων ἐπαινέταις καὶ συνηγόροις.*

[31] Eunapius in vita Aedesii (in the beginning): *Κωνσταντῖνος ἐβασίλευε, τά τε τῶν ἱερῶν ἐπιφανέστατα καταστρέφων, καὶ τὰ τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀνεγειρων οἰκήματα· τὰ δὲ ἴσως καὶ τὸ τῶν ὁμιλητῶν ἄριστον πρὸς μυστηριώδη τινὰ σιωπὴν καὶ ἱεροφαντικὴν ἐχεμυθίαν ἐπιῤῥεπὲς ἦν καὶ συνεκέκλιτο.*

[32] See an account of them in Dr A. Westermann's Gesch. d. griech. Beredsamkeit. (Leipzig 1833). S. 239.

[33] They were for some time excommunicated because they kept up intercourse with the heathen sophist Epiphanius, and had been present when he read a hymn before Dionysius. (Socrates ii. 46. Sozom. vi. 25).

most distinguished spiritual orators among the Christians were obliged to receive their education in heathen schools.

Under these circumstances it cannot appear strange that we should find most attachment to paganism in the higher ranks;[34] or that we should hear even from Christian writers, that among the great numbers which certainly passed over to Christianity at this time, the majority were unfortunately led to that step merely by external considerations.[35] Others on the contrary wavered between the old and new religion, hoping to find the truth between. From this tendency even new sects sprang up, of which the *Massalians (Euchites, Euphemites,* Θεοσβεῖς) in Phoenicia and Palestine,[36] and the *Hypsistarii* in Cappadocia,[37]

[34] Comp. the steadfastness of Aristophanes in heathenism Libanii orat. pro Arist. ed. Reiske vol. i. p. 447 s. Hence the rhetorician Victorinus did not venture at first to make his conversion public: Augustini confess. viii. 3: idolis sacrisque sacrilegis tunc tota fere romana nobilitas inflata inspirabat populos. 4: Amicos suos reverebatur offendere superbos daemonicolas, quorum ex culmine babylonicae dignitatis, quasi ex cedris Libani, quas nondum contriverat Dominus, graviter ruituras in se inimicitias arbitrabatur.

[35] Eusebius vita Const. iv. 54: *καὶ γὰρ οὖν ἀληθῶς δύο χαλεπὰ ταῦτα κατὰ τοὺς δηλουμένους τούτους καὶ αὐτοὶ κατενοήσαμεν· ἐπιτριβὴν ἀπλήστων καὶ μοχθηρῶν ἀνδρῶν τῶν πάντα λυμαινομένων βίον· εἰρωνείαν τ' ἄλεκτον τῶν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὑποδυομένων καὶ τὸ Χριστιανῶν ἐπιπλάστως σχηματιζομένων ὄνομα. Τὸ δ' αὐτοῦ* (Κωνσταντίνου) *φιλάνθρωπον καὶ φιλάγαθον—ἐνῆγεν αὐτὸν πιστεύειν τῷ σχήματι τῶν Χριστιανῶν εἶναι νομιζομένων.* Such apparent Christians are described by Libanius orat. pro templis (ed. Reiske vol. ii. p. 177), in the church: *καταστάντες δὲ εἰς σχῆμα τὸ τῶν εὐχομένων, ἢ οὐδένα καλοῦσιν, ἢ τοὺς θεούς, οὐ καλῶς μὲν ἐκ τοῦ τοιούτου χωρίου, καλοῦσι δ' οὖν. Ὥσπερ οὖν ἐν ταῖς τραγῳδίαις ὁ τὸν τύραννον εἰσιὼν οὐκ ἔστι τύραννος, ἀλλ' ὅπερ ἦν πρὸ τοῦ προσωπείου. οὕτω καὶ ἐκείνων ἕκαστος τηρεῖ μὲν αὐτὸν ἀκίνητον, δοκεῖ δὲ τούτοις κεκινῆσθαι.*

[36] Epiphanius haer. lxxx. Massalianorum § 1. *Μασσαλιανοί, Εὐφημῖται—ἐξ Ἑλλήνων ὡρμῶντο, οὔτε Ἰουδαϊσμῷ προσανέχοντες, οὔτε Χριστιανοὶ ὑπάρχοντες, οὔτε ἀπὸ Σαμαρειτῶν, ἀλλά μόνων Ἑλληνες ὄντες δῆθεν· καὶ θεοὺς μὲν λέγοντες, μηδενὶ μηδὲν προσκυνοῦντες, ἑνὶ δέ μόνον δῆθεν τὸ σέβας νέμοντες καὶ καλοῦντες παντοκράτορα· τινὰς δὲ οἴκους ἑαυτοῖς κατασκευάσαντες, ἢ τόπους πλατεῖς, φόρων δίκην, προσευχὰς ταύτας ἑκάλουν.* § 2: *ἐν ἄλλοις δὲ τόποις φύσει καὶ* (leg. *προσευχὰς*) *Ἐκκλησίας ὁμοιώματι ἑαυτοῖς τοιήσαντες, καθ' ἑσπέραν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἕω, μετὰ πολλῆς λυχναψίας καὶ φώτων συναθροιζόμενοι, ἐπὶ πολύ τε καταλεγμάτιά* [leg. *καταληγμάτιά* cantiunculas] *τινα ὑπὸ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς σπουδαίων, καὶ εὐφημίαις τινὰς δῆθεν εἰς τὸν θεὸν ποιούμενοι—ὥσπερ θεὸν ἐξιλεούμενοι ἑαυτοὺς ἀπατῶσιν.* Cyrillus Alex. de adoratione in spiritu et veritate lib. iii. (ed. Auberti T. i. p. 92) says of the religion of those who were not the children of Abraham in the old world, Jethro, Melchisedek, &c., *προσεκύνουν μὲν γὰρ—ὑψίστῳ*

of nearly the same sentiments, appeared in the first half of the fourth century. Towards the end of the same century, the Caelicolae in Africa arose.[38] None of these parties however, attained to much importance or continued long.

Θεῷ—προσεδέχοντο δὲ καὶ ἑτέρους τάχα που θεούς, ἐναριθμοῦντες αὐτῷ τὰ ἐξαίρετα τῶν κτισμάτων, γῆν τε καὶ οὐρανόν, ἥλιον καὶ σελήνην, καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄστρων ἐπισημότερα. Καὶ πλημμέλημα μὲν ἀρχαῖον ἡ ἐπὶ τῷδε καταφθορὰ καὶ πλάνησις, δήκει δὲ καὶ εἰς δεῦρο καὶ παρατείνεται· φρονοῦσι γὰρ ὧδε παραληροῦντες ἔτι τῶν ἐν τῇ Φοινίκῃ καὶ Παλαιστίνῃ τινές, οἱ σφᾶς μὲν αὐτοὺς θεοσεβεῖς ὀνομάζουσιν, οἷμον δέ τινα θρησκείας διαστείχουσι μέσην, οὔτε τοῖς Ἰουδαίων ἔθεσι καθαρῶς, οὔτε τοῖς Ἑλλήνων προσκείμενοι, εἰς ἄμφω δὲ ὥσπερ διαῤῥιπτούμενοι καὶ μεμερισμένοι. To these, too, Libanius perhaps refers, Libanii epist. ad Priscianum Praesidem Palaestinae (ed. Vales. in not. ad Socr. i. 22. Libanii epist. ed. Wolf p. 624): οἱ τὸν ἥλιον οὗτοι θεραπεύοντες ἄνευ αἵματος, καὶ τιμῶντες θεὸν προσηγορίᾳ δευτέρᾳ, καὶ τὴν γαστέρα κολάζοντες, καὶ ἐν κέρδει ποιούμενοι τὴν τῆς τελευτῆς ἡμέραν, πολλαχοῦ μὲν εἰσὶ τῆς γῆς, πανταχοῦ δὲ ὀλιγοι, καὶ ἀδικοῦσι μὲν οὐδένα, λυποῦνται δὲ ὑπ' ἐνίων. Βούλομαι δὲ τοὺς ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ τούτων διατρίβοντας τὴν σὴν ἀρετὴν ἔχειν καταφυγήν, καὶ εἶναι σφίσιν ἄδειαν, καὶ μὴ ἐξεῖναι τοῖς βουλομένοις εἰς αὐτοὺς ὑβρίζειν. Valesius supposes the Manichaeans to be meant here.

[37] Concerning this sect, see especially Gregory of Nazianzum in the funeral oration on his father Gregory, who had at first belonged to them, Orat. xviii. (al. xix.) § 5. He designates the party as ἐκ δυοῖν ἐναντιωτάτοιν συγκεκραμένη, ἑλληνικῆς τε πλάνης καὶ νομικῆς τερατείας ὧν ἀμφοτέρων τὰ μέρη φυγών, ἐκ μέρων συνετέθη· τῆς μὲν γὰρ τὰ εἴδωλα καὶ τὰς θυσίας ἀποπεμπόμενοι, τιμῶσι τὸ πῦρ καὶ τὰ λύχνα· τῆς δὲ τὸ σάββατον αἰδούμενοι, καὶ τὴν περὶ τὰ πρόβατα (leg. τὸ περὶ τὰ βρώματα) ἕς τινα μικρολογίαν, τὴν περιτομὴν ἀτιμάζουσι. Ὑψιστάριοι τοῖς ταπεινοῖς ὄνομα, καὶ ὁ παντοκράτωρ δὴ μόνος αὐτοῖς σεβάσμιος. Gregorius Nyss. contra Eunom. (Opp. i. 12): Ὑψιστιανῶν αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ πρὸς τοὺς Χριστιανοὺς διαφορὰ, τὸ θεὸν μὲν αὐτοὺς ὁμολογεῖν εἶναί τινα, ὃν ὀνομάζουσιν ὕψιστον, ἢ παντοκράτορα· πατέρα δὲ αὐτὸν εἶναι μὴ παραδέχεσθαι. Information respecting the Hypsistarians, Messalians, Θεοσεβεῖς, &c.: C. Ullmann de Hypsistariis comm. Heidelb. 1823. 4. Guil. Boehmer de Hypsistariis, opinionibusque quae super eis propositae sunt. Berol. 1824. 8. Ullmann in the Heidelb. Jahrb. 1824. no. 17. A reviewer in the Jen. A. L. Z. Dec. 1824. S. 455. Ullmann Gregorius v. Nazianz. Darmst. 1825. S. 558. Böhmer einige Bemerkungen zu den v. d. H. Prof. Ullmann und mir aufgestellten Ansichten über den Ursprung und den Charakter der Hypsistarier. Hamburg. 1826. 8. Ullmann explains the origin of the Hypsistarii from a blending together of Judaism and Parsism; Boehmer, following Cyril (see above note 36), regards them as the same party as the Messalians and Θεοσεβεῖς, and perceives in them the remnant of a monotheism derived from primitive revelation, but afterwards disfigured by Sabaeism. Gesenius monum. Phoeniciae i. 135, ii. 384, puts along with them the Abellonii ap. Augustin. de haer. c. 87. אבעלינים from אב עליון; but the Abellonii are manifestly a Christian sect.

[38] There are two laws of Honorius against them, Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. 5, l. 43, A.D. 408 (Caelicolae, qui nescio cujus dogmatis novi conven-

§ 76.

JULIAN THE APOSTATE.

A. Neander über den Kaiser Julianus und sein Zeitalter. Leipzig 1812. 8. (Comp. Schlosser's review in the Jen. A. L. Z. Jan. 1813. S. 121 ff.) Neander's Kirchengesch. ii. i. 75. C. Ullmann's Gregorius v. Nazianz, der Theologe. Darmst. 1825. 8. S. 72 ff. C. H. van Herwerden de Juliano Imp. relig. christ. hoste, eodemque vindice. Lugd. Bat. 1827. 8. Julian d. Abtrünnige, v. D. G. Fr. Wiggers, in Illgen's Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol. vii. 1, 115. Gfrörer's Kirchengesch. ii. 1, 155.

The injury which Julian had to endure from the first Christian emperors, the strict education by which Christianity was attempted to be forced upon him, and his early private acquaintance with new platonic philosophers, especially *Maximus*, had early disposed him towards heathenism, whose dead forms had been animated with so much life by the new platonists.[1] When he attained to the imperial dignity (361), he declared himself openly in favour of the ancient national religion to which he endeavoured to impart a more moral and religious form, even by introducing many practices borrowed from Christianity,[2] while

tus habent), and lib. xvi. tit. 8, l. 19, A.D. 409. Comp. Gothofredus on the last law, and J. A. Schmid hist. caelicolarum. Helmst. 1704.

[1] Henke de theologia Juliani diss. 1777 (reprinted in his opusc. academ. Lips. 1802, p. 353 ss.)

[2] Juliani epist. 49, ad Arsacium Pontif. Galatiae, on the morals and conduct of priests (comp. especially Fragmentum in Juliani opp. ed. Spanh. p. 298. Ullmann's Gregor. v. Nazianz S. 527 ff.), support of the poor, and erection of houses for the reception of strangers. Ep. 52 concerning penitents. Julian established hierarchical gradations among the priests (Ep. 62), and wished them to receive higher honour than civil officers (Fragmentum p. 296, Ep. 49). Sozomenus v. 16 says of him: *ὑπολαβὼν, τὸν Χριστιανισμὸν τὴν σύστασιν ἔχειν ἐκ τοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς πολιτείας τῶν αὐτὸν μετιόντων, διενοεῖτο πανταχῇ τοὺς ἑλληνικοὺς ναοὺς τῇ παρασκευῇ καὶ τῇ τάξει τῆς Χριστιανῶν θρησκείας διακοσμεῖν· βήμασί τε, καὶ προοιμίοις, καὶ ἑλληνίκων δογμάτων καὶ παραινέσεων διδασκάλοις τε καὶ ἀναγνώσταις, ὡρῶν τε ἐητῶν καὶ ἡμερῶν τεταγμέναις εὐχαῖς, φροντιστηρίοις τε ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν φιλοσοφεῖν ἐγνωκότων* (Julian led even an ascetic life, cf. Misopogon in Opp. p. 345, 350. Ammianus Marcellin. xxv. 4), *καὶ καταγωγίοις ξένων καὶ πτωχῶν, καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ τῇ περὶ τοὺς δεομένους φιλανθρωπίᾳ τὸ ἑλληνικὸν δόγμα σεμνύναι· ἐκουσίων τε καὶ ἀκουσίων ἁμαρτημάτων κατὰ τὴν τῶν Χριστιανῶν παράδοσιν ἐκ μεταμελείας σύμμετρον τάξαι σωφρονισμόν. Οὐχ ἥκιστα*

he himself thought that he was only restoring the worship of the gods to its original purity, and practised it with greater zeal.[3] He took away their privileges from the Christians,[4] and forbade them to appear as public teachers of the national literature;[5] but he promised them full toleration in other respects. He was guilty, however, of many acts of injustice towards them, often, it is true, provoked by their intemperate zeal.[6] But they

δὲ ζηλῶσαι λέγεται τὰ συνθήματα τῶν ἐπισκοπικῶν γραμμάτων κ. τ. λ. Cf. Gregorii Nazianz. adv. Julian. orat. iii. p. 101 ss.

[3] In a manner too zealous even for cultivated heathens, Ammianus Marcell. xxv. 4: praesagiorum sciscitationi nimiae deditus,—superstitiosus magis, quam sacrorum legitimus observator, innumeras sine parsimonia pecudes mactans, ut aestimaretur, si revertisset de Parthis, boves jam defuturos.

[4] The law concerning the restoration of possessions held by them in the cities has strangely enough found its way into the Cod. Theod. lib. x. tit. 3. l. 1. cf. Sozom. v. 25.

[5] Juliani epist. 42.—Ἄτοπον εἶναί μοι φαίνεται διδάσκειν ἐκεῖνα τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ὅσα μὴ νομίζουσιν εὖ ἔχειν· ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν οἴονται σοφὰ, ὧν εἰσιν ἐξηγηταὶ, καὶ ὧν ὥσπερ προφῆται κάθηνται, ζηλούτωσαν αὐτῶν πρῶτον τὴν εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσέβειαν. εἰ δὲ [del. εἰς] τοὺς τιμιωτάτους ὑπολαμβάνουσι πεπλανῆσθαι, βαδιζόντων εἰς τὰς τῶν Γαλιλαίων ἐκκλησίας, ἐξηγησόμενοι Ματθαῖον καὶ Λουκᾶν κ. τ. λ. Socrates iii. 12, 16. Sozomenus v. 18. Ammian. Marcellin. xxii. 10: Illud autem erat inclemens, obruendum perenni silentio, quod arcebat docere magistros rhetoricos et grammaticos, ritus christiani cultores (cf. xxv. 4). The sacred national literature appeared to him to be profaned by the contradictory and scoffing Christian interpretation. But there is no ground in this to attribute to him the design of degrading the Christians into a state of ignorance, as has been frequently done by writers. For there were so few Christian grammarians, on account of the prejudices with which they had to contend among their brethren of the same faith (see § 75. note 27), that Christians had almost the only opportunity of studying the ancient literature under heathen preceptors, a thing which they might yet do without prohibition. In the mean time, however, some Christian authors, especially the two Apollinaris, and Gregory of Nazianzum, were led by that prohibition to attempt imitations of heathen works in poetry and eloquence with biblical materials, Socrat. iii. 16. Sozom. v. 18.

[6] Juliani ep. 52 ad Bostrenos concerning the Christian bishops:—ὅτι μὴ τυραννεῖν ἔξεστιν αὐτοῖς,—παροξυνόμενοι πάντα κινοῦσι λίθον, καὶ συνταράττειν τολμῶσι τὰ πλήθη, καὶ στασιάζειν.—Οὐδένα γοῦν αὐτῶν ἄκοντα πρὸς βωμοὺς ἐῶμεν ἕλκεσθαι· διαρρήδην δὲ αὐτοῖς προσαγορεύομεν, εἴ τις ἐκὼν χερνίβων καὶ σπονδῶν ἡμῖν ἐθέλει κοινωνεῖν, καθάρσια προσφέρεσθαι πρῶτον, καὶ τοὺς ἀποτροπαίους ἱκετεύειν θεούς.—Τὰ γοῦν πλήθη τὰ παρὰ τῶν λεγομένων Κληρικῶν ἐξηπατημένα πρόδηλον ὅτι ταύτης ἀφαιρεθείσης στασιάζει τῆς ἀδείας. Οἱ γὰρ εἰς τοῦτο τετυραννηκότες,—ποθοῦντες δὲ τὴν προτέραν δυναστείαν, ὅτι μὴ δικάζειν ἔξεστιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ γράφειν διαθήκας, καὶ ἀλλοτρίους σφετερίζεσθαι

had still more to suffer from the heathen governors and people. Hence it was natural that many who had hitherto been Christian professors for the sake of external advantages, should now go back to heathenism from the same motives.[7] The Jewish religion was respected by Julian as an ancient national faith; and on his march against the Persians, he even permitted the temple at Jerusalem to be rebuilt, though it was soon after destroyed.[8] On this same expedition he composed in Antioch, where he bore the scoffs of the Christian people with philosophical indifference, his work *against Christianity*.[9] Soon after this he was killed in a battle with the Persians (363).[10]

κλήρους, καὶ τὰ πάντα ἑαυτοῖς προσνέμειν, πάντα κινοῦσιν ἀκοσμίας κάλων— εἰς διάστασιν ἄγοντες τὰ πλήθη.

[7] Of them speaks (sometimes in the manner of Julian) Asterius ep. Amaseae orat. adv. avaritiam (in Combefisii auctar. novum p. 56): λαβόντες ὑποσχέσεις παρὰ τῶν ἀθέων καὶ ἀσεβῶν, ἢ ζωῆς ἀρχοντικῆς, ἢ περιουσίας τῆς ἐκ βασιλικῶν ταμιείων, ὥσπερ ἰμάτιον ταχέως τὴν θρησκείαν μετημφιέσαντο.—ὅτι γὰρ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐκεῖνος—αὐτός τε ἀναιδῶς ἔθυεν δαίμοσιν, καὶ τοῖς τοῦτο βουλομένοις ποιεῖν πολλὰ προετέθη τὰ γέρα, πόσοι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀφέντες ἐπὶ τοὺς βωμοὺς ἔδραμον; πόσοι δὲ, τὸ τῶν ἀξιωμάτων δέλεαρ εἰσδεξάμενοι, μετ' ἐκείνου κατέπιον τὸ τῆς παραβάσεως ἄγκιστρον; cf. Themistii oratio consularis ad Jovianum ed. Petav. p. 278: ἐλεγχόμεθα πάνυ γελοίως ἀλουργῖδας, οὐ θεὸν θεραπεύοντες, καὶ ἐᾶον Εὐρίπου μεταβαλλόμενοι τὰς ἀγιστείας. καὶ πάλαι μὲν εἷς θηραμένης, νῦν δὲ ἅπαντες κῶθορνοι, μικροῦ δεῖν χθὲς ἐν τοῖς δέκα, σήμερον δὲ ἐν τοῖς πεντήκοντα, οἱ αὐτοὶ πρὸς βωμοῖς, πρὸς ἱερείοις, πρὸς ἀγάλμασι, πρὸς τραπέζαις.

[8] Juliani epist. 25.—An earthquake and flames of fire prevented the workmen. Gregor. Nazianz. orat. iv. Chrysostomus homil. iii. adv. Judaeos. Ammianus Marcellinus xxiii. 1. Socrates iii. 20. Sozom. v. 22. Theodoret iii. 15. In like manner, fire burst forth when Herod wished to penetrate farther into the sepulchre of David (Joseph. antiqu. xvi. 7. 1.). These phenomena are explained by the bituminous soil. Comp. Michaelis on the vaults under the temple-mountain in Lichtenberg's and Forster's Götting. Magazin, 3tem Jahrg. (1783) S. 772.

[9] According to Hieron. ep. 84. ad Magnum 7, and Cyrillus adv. Jul. prooem. 3 books. Fragments in Cyrilli Alexandr. adv. Julianum libb. x. published separately: Défense du Paganisme par l'empereur Julien par Mr. le Marquis d'Argens. Berlin 1764. ed. 3. 1769. 8. (Comp. the review in Ernesti's n. theol. Bibl. Th. 8. S. 551 ff.)

[10] Comp. Ammianus Marcellinus xxv. 3. Eutropii breviar. x. 8, both of whom accompanied the expedition.—Libanius ἐπιτάχιος ἐπ' Ἰουλιανῷ (ed Reiske vol. i. p. 614) hints that he was killed by a Christian, cf. Sozomenus vi. 1. 2. Juliani Imp. opera (Orationes viii. Caesares, Μισοπώγων, Epistolae 65.) et Cyrilli contra impium Julianum libb. x. ed. Ezechiel Spanhemius. Lips. 1696 fol.

§ 77.

GENERAL TOLERATION TILL 381.

The reign of *Jovian* († 364) was in so critical times that he found it advisable to allow full freedom to all religions,[1] although he himself was a zealous Christian.[2] But this very disposition of the emperor encouraged the Christians in many places not only to demand restitution for injuries actually suffered under the preceding reign, but also to exhibit their hatred against the pagans, which had been increased by Julian's measures.[3] The legal toleration of all religions also continued under the following emperors, *Valentinian I.* (in the west † 375),[4] and *Valens*, (in the east † 378,[5]) although they forbade bloody sacrifices;[6] in like manner, in the first years of the emperors *Gratian* and *Valentinian II.* in the west, and *Theodosius* in the east, till the

[1] Themistii oratio consularis ad Jovianum ed. Petav. p. 278: *τά τε ἄλλα αὐτοκράτωρ ὤν τε καὶ εἰς τέλος ἐσόμενος, τὸ τῆς ἀγιστείας μέρος ἅπαντος εἶναι νομοθετεῖς· καὶ τοῦτο ζηλῶν τὸν θεόν, ὃς τὸ μὲν ἔχειν πρὸς εὐσέβειαν ἐπιτηδείως, τῆς φύσεως κοινὸν ἐποίησε τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης· τὸν τρόπον δὲ τῆς θεραπείας ἐξῆψε τῆς ἐν ἑκάστῳ βουλήσεως.*

[2] He restored all rights to the churches and clergy, Sozom. vi. 3, also the *σύνταξις τοῦ σίτου* (comp. § 53. not. 9. § 76. not. 4), but by way of preliminary only the third part, on account of a famine. Theodoret. iv. 4.

[3] To this refers Libanius epitaph. in Julianum ed. Reiske vol. i. p. 619. The shutting up of the temples, and the withdrawment of the priests and philosophers, of which Socrates iii. 24 speaks, was the consequence of fear.

[4] Cod. Theodos. lib. ix. tit. 16. l. 9. (A.D. 371): Haruspicinam ego nullum cum maleficiorum causis habere consortium judico, neque ipsam, aut aliquam praeterea concessam a majoribus religionem genus esse arbitror criminis. Testes sunt leges a me in exordio imperii mei datae, quibus unicuique, quod animo imbibisset, colendi libera facultas tributa est. Nec haruspicinam reprehendimus, sed nocenter exerceri vetamus. cf. Ammian. Marcell. xxx. 9. Rüdiger de statu Pagan. p. 42 ss. Evidences of heathen worship at this time may be derived from inscriptions. Beugnot i. 270.

[5] Themistii oratio ad Valentem de religionibus, known only in the Latin translation of Andreas Duditius (ed. Petav. p. 499), with the similar contents of the Orat. ad Jovin. (not. 1.)

[6] According to Libanii orat. de templis ed. Reiske vol. ii. p. 163: *τὸ θύειν ἱερεῖα—ἐκωλύθη παρὰ τοῖν ἀδελφοῖν, ἀλλ' οὐ τὸ λιβανωτόν.*

year 381; while the continued irruptions of barbarous nations and internal commotions compelled them to avoid everything by which disturbances might have been increased still more.

§ 78.

SUPPRESSION OF PAGANISM BY THEODOSIUS.

Rüdiger de statu Paganorum sub Impp. christ. p. 47. Jan. Henr. Stuffken diss. de Theodosii M. in rem christianam meritis. Lugd. Bat. 1828. 8. p. 16. A. Beugnot hist. de la déstruction du Paganisme en Occident. i. 345.

After Theodosius had secured the east against the Gothis, he directed his greatest energies to the suppression of paganism. In the same year in which he summoned the second occumenical synod at Constantinople, (381), he forbade apostacy to paganism,[1] but still allowed the other rites of heathen worship to be practised except sacrifice. The two emperors of the west followed his example. *Gratian* laid aside the dignity of pontifex maximus,[2] commanded the altar of Victoria to be removed from

[1] Cod. Theodos. lib. xvi. tit. 7. l. 1: His, qui ex Christianis Pagani facti sunt, eripiatur facultas jusque testandi. Omne defuncti, si quod est, testamentum, submota conditione, rescindatur. Gratian and Valentinian made the same regulation in the west. L. 3. (382).—Lib. xvi. tit. 10. l. 7. (381): Si qui vetitis sacrificiis, diurnis nocturnisque, velut vesanus ac sacrilegus incertorum consultor (animum) immerserit, fanumque sibi aut templum ad hujuscemodi sceleris excusationem assumendum crediderit, vel putaverit adeundum, proscriptioni se noverit subjugandum, cum nos justa institutione moneamus, castis Deum precibus excolendum, non diris carminibus profanandum.

[2] According to Zosimus iv. c. 36, who alone speaks of the circumstance, he might have refused it as soon as it fell to him, that is, after the death of Valens (for only the first Augustus was pontifex maximus). This supposition, however, is contradicted by the fact that Gratian bore the same title for some time. See Ausonii gratiarum actio pro consulatu, and the inscriptions in Orelli inscriptionum latinarum amplissima collectio vol. i. p. 245. The usual assumption that Gratian merely declined the priestly dress offered to him, but yet bore the title, is arbitrary; for Zosimus speaks in express terms of the refusal of the dress and of the title. Hence, it must be maintained that Gratian wore that dignity for some years, and then laid it aside. J. A. Bosius de pontificatu maximo Impp. praecipue christianorum, in Graevii thesaur. antiquitt. Rom. t. v. p. 271 ss. De la Bastie du souverain pontificat des empereurs Romains

the senate-house, and took away all privileges from the pagan worship,[3] although he was obliged to suffer in Rome the sacrifices elsewhere forbidden, as Theodosius had to do at Alexandria.[4] In Rome, paganism continued to be predominant,[5] particularly among families of distinction;[6] but yet the attempts made by the prefect of the city Q. *Aurelius Symmachus* to have the former regulations restored, and in particular the altar of Victoria re-erected, had no influence upon *Gratian* († 383), *Valentinian II.*, and *Theodosius*.[7] In the east, the Christians proceeded far beyond the imperial ordinances. Enterprising bishops led mobs of hirelings or fanatics against the temples;[8] and the monks especially often combined for the destruction of all heathen sanc-

in the Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscr. t. xv. p. 75 ss. Jos. Eckhel doctr. numor. vett. P. ii. vol. 8. p. 386 ss. Birger Thorlacius de Imp. Rom., qui religioni Christi nomen dederunt, pontificatu maximo. Havn. 1811.

[3] He took away Vestalium virginum praerogativam, Sacerdotii immunitatem (which Valentinian I. had confirmed even in 371, Cod. Theod. xii. i. 75) caused the real estates belonging to the temples (agros virginibus et ministris deficientium voluntate legatos) to be drawn into the exchequer (cf. Theod. xvi. 10, 20), and deprived the vestal virgins and priests of victum modicum justaque privilegia. Symmachus lib. x. ep. 61. Ambros. ep. 17.

[4] Libanius ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶν (ed Reiske vol. ii. p. 181): *οὐ τοίνυν τῇ Ῥώμῃ μόνον ἐφυλάχθη τὸ θύειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ τοῦ Σαράπιδος, τῇ πολλῇ τε καὶ μεγάλῃ καὶ πλῆθος κεκτημένῃ νεῶν, δι' ὧν κοινὴν ἁπάντων ἀνθρώπων ποιεῖ τὴν τῆς Αἰγύπτου φοράν. Αὐτὴ δὲ ἔργον τοῦ Νείλου, τον Νεῖλμον δὲ ἐστιᾷ ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ τὰς ἀρούρας πειθουσα. ὧν οὐ ποιουμένων, ὅτε τε χρὴ, καὶ παρ' ὧν, οὐδ' ἂν αὐτὸς ἐθελήσειεν, ἃ μοι δοκοῦσιν εἰδότες οἱ καὶ ταῦτα ἂν ἡδέως ἀνελόντες οὐκ ἀνελεῖν, ἀλλ' ἀφεῖναι τὸν ποταμὸν εὐωχεισθαι τοις παλαιοις νομίμοις, ἐπὶ μισθῷ τῷ εἰωθότι.*

[5] According to Hieronymus in epist. ad Gal. iv. 3, the Romans were omnium superstitionum sentina.

[6] Respecting the heads of Paganism at Rome, Praetextatus, Symmachus, Flavianus, Caecina Albinus, &c., who are introduced speaking in the Saturnalia of Macrobius, see Alph. Mahul sur la vie et les ouvrages de Macrobe in the classical Journal xxxi. 81. Beugnot i. 438.

[7] Two embassies, with Symmachus at the head, the first in 382 to Gratian, the second in 384 to Valentinian II. See Symmachi epistoll. lib. x. ep. 61. On the other side, Ambrosii epist. 17 and 18 ad Valentinianum. Respecting two later equally fruitless embassies, the one to Theodosius, when he was staying at Milan, the other to Valentinian, see Ambross. ep. 57 ad Eugenium. Beugnot i. 410.

[8] So Eulogius, bishop of Edessa (see Libanius pro templis ed. Reiske vol. ii. p. 192 ss. Gothofredus ad Cod. Theod. xvi. 10, 8); Marcellus, bishop of Apamea (Sozom. vii. 15. Theodoret. v. 21); but particularly Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria. See below note 12. Rüdiger l. c. p. 58 ss.

tuaries.[9] The appeal ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶν (388—390)[10] of the eloquent *Libanius*, addressed to Theodosius, had no effect; the heathen were immediately afterwards forbidden by imperial laws even to repair to the temples;[11] and the destruction of the splendid temple of Serapis (391)[12] by the violent Theophilus, bishop of

[9] Libanius ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶν (ed. Reiske vol. ii. p. 164): σὺ μὲν οὖν οὔθ' ἱερὰ κεκλεῖσθαι (ἐκέλευσας), οὔτε μηδένα προσιέναι· οὔτε πῦρ, οὔτε λιβανωτὸν, οὔτε τὰς ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων θυμιαμάτων τιμὰς ἐξήλασας τῶν νεῶν, οὐδὲ τῶν βωμῶν. οἱ δὲ μελανειμονοῦντες οὗτοι καὶ πλείω μὲν τῶν ἐλεφάντων ἐσθίοντες, πόνον δὲ παρέχοντες τῷ πλήθει τῶν ἐκπωμάτων τοῖς δι' ᾠσμάτων αὐτοῖς παραπέμπουσι τὸ ποτὸν, συγκρύπτοντες δὲ ταῦτα ὠχρότητι τῇ διὰ τέχνης αὐτοῖς πεπορισμένῃ, μένοντος, ὦ βασιλεῦ, καὶ κρατοῦντος τοῦ νόμου, θέουσιν ἐφ' ἱερὰ, ξύλα φέροντες καὶ λίθους καὶ σιδηρὸν, οἱ δὲ καὶ ἄνευ τούτων, χεῖρας καὶ πόδας. ἔπειτα Μυσῶν λεια καθαιρουμένων ὀροφῶν, κατασκαπτομένων τοίχων, κατασπωμένων ἀγαλμάτων, ἀνασπωμένων βωμῶν. τοὺς ἱερεῖς δὲ ἢ σιγᾷν, ἢ τεθνᾶναι δεῖ. τῶν πρώτων δὲ κειμένων, δρόμος ἐπὶ τὰ δεύτερα καὶ τρίτα. καὶ τρόπαια τροπαίοις ἐναντία τῷ νόμῳ συνείρεται. τολμᾶται μὲν οὖν κἂν ταῖς πόλεσιν, τὸ πολὺ δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῖς. p. 168, ἐστὶ δὲ οὗτος ὁ πόλεμος πόρος τῶν μὲν τοῖς ναοῖς ἐγκειμένων, τῶν δὲ τὰ ὄντα τοις ταλαιπώροις (γεώργοις) ἁρπαζόντων, τά τε κείμενα αὐτοις ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἃ τρέφουσιν, ὥστ' ἀπέρχονται φέροντες οἱ ἐπελθόντες τὰ τῶν ἐκπεπολιορκημένων. τοῖς δ' οὐκ ἀρκει ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ γῆν ὠφετερίζονται, τὴν τοῦ δεῖνος ἱερὰν εἶναι λέγοντες, καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν πατρῴων ἐστέρηνται δι' ὀνόματος οὐκ ἀληθοῦς. οἱ δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἑτέρων τρυφῶσι κακῶν, οἱ τῷ πεινῇν, ὡς φασι, τὸν αὐτῶν θεραπεύοντες θεόν. ἦν δὲ οἱ πεπορθημένοι παρὰ τὸν ἐν ἄστει τοιμένα (καλοῦσι γὰρ οὕτως ἄνδρα οὐ πάνυ χρηστόν), ἣν οὖν ἐλθόντες ὀδύρωνται, λέγοντες ἃ ἠδίκηνται, ὁ ποιμὴν οὗτος τοὺς μὲν ἐπῆνεσε, τοὺς δὲ ἀπήλασεν, ὡς ἐν τῷ μὴ μείζω πεπουθέναι κεκερδακότας· καίτοι τῆς μὲν σῆς ἀρχῆς, ὦ βασιλεῦ, καὶ οὗτοι, τοσούτῳ δὲ χρησιμώτεροι τῶν ἀδικούντων αὐτοὺς, ὅσῳ τῶν ἀργούντων οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ταῖς μελίτταις, οἱ δὲ τοῖς κηφῆσιν ἐοίκασι. κἂν ἀκούσωσιν ἀγρὸν ἔχειν τι τῶν ἁρπασθῆναι δυναμένων, εὐθὺς οὗτος ἐν θυσίαις τέ ἐστι, καὶ δεινὰ ποιεῖ, καὶ δεῖ στρατείας ἐπ' αὐτὸν, καὶ πάρεισιν οἱ σωφρονισταὶ κ. τ. λ. Cf. Theodoretus v. 21.

[10] Still incomplete in Reiske, but complete for the first time in Novus SS. Patrum Graecorum saeculi quarti delectus, rec. et adnotatione instruxit Lud. de Sinner. Paris. 1842. 8.

[11] Valentinian's law for the west, of the 27th February 391. Cod. Theodos. xvi. 10, 10: Nemo se hostiis polluat, nemo insontem victimam caedat, nemo delubra adeat, templa perlustret, et mortali opere formata simulacra suscipiat. Judices quoque hanc formam contineant, ut si quis —templum uspiam—adoraturus intraverit, quindecim pondo auri ipse protinus inferre cogatur. The same was decreed for the east by Theodosius L. 11, 17th June 391.

[12] Socrates v. 16. Sozom. vii. 15. Theodoret. v. 22. Eunapius in vita Aedesii ed. Schotti p. 63 ss. Zosimus v. 23, especially Rufinus, who was at that time in Palestine, hist. eccl. xi. 22—30. Many impositions of the priests were hereby detected, Theodor. l. c., Rufinus l. c. 23—25. The heathens were particularly and deeply impressed by the circumstance that the expectation, quod si humana manus simulacrum illud

Alexandria, after a bloody contest, announced the total overthrow of paganism in the east.

When Theodosius had become sole master of the entire Roman empire after the death of *Valentinian II.* († 392), he forbade all kinds of idolatry by the most severe punishments (392);[13] and during his abode at Rome (394) he brought public sacrifices to an end by interdicting the defraying of them out of the imperial purse. At that time, he even called upon the senate to declare themselves in favour of Christianity; but the

(Serapis) contigisset, terra dehiscens illico solveretur in chaos, caelumque repente rueret in praeceps (Rufin. l. c. 23), had not been fulfilled at the destruction of the statue, and the fear which still remained, Serapin injuriae memorem aquas ultra et affluentiam solitam non largiturum (Rufin. l. c. 30, cf. Libanius, above note 4), was contradicted by an ample inundation of the Nile.

[13] Cod. Theodos. xvi. 10, 12. Impp. Theodosius, Arcadius et Honorius AA. ad Rufinum Pf. P.: Nullus omnino, ex quolibet genere, ordine hominum, dignitatum, vel in potestate positus, vel honore perfunctus, sive potens sorte nascendi, seu humilis genere, conditione, fortuna, in nullo penitus loco, in nulla urbe, sensu carentibus simulacris vel insontem victimam caedat, vel secretiore piaculo larem igne, mero genium, penates nidore veneratus, accendat lumina, imponat thura, serta suspendat. § 1. Quodsi quispiam immolare hostiam sacrificaturus audebit, aut spirantia exta consulere, ad exemplum majestatis reus licita cunctis accusatione delatus, excipiat sententiam competentem, etiamsi nihil contra salutem principum, aut de salute quaesierit. Sufficit enim ad criminis molem, naturae ipsius leges velle rescindere, illicita perscrutari, occulta recludere, interdicta tentare, finem quaerere salutis alienae, spem alieni interitus polliceri. § 2. Si quis vero mortali opere facta et aevum passura simulacra imposito thure venerabitur, ac, ridiculo exemplo metuens subito, quae ipse simulaverit, vel redimita vittis arbore, vel erecta effossis ara cespitibus vanas imagines, humiliore licet muneris praemio, tamen plena religionis injuria honorare tentaverit, is, utpote violatae religionis reus, ea domo seu possessione multabitur, in qua eum gentilitia consterit superstitione famulatum. Namque omnia loca, quae thuris constiterit vapore fumasse (si tamen ea in jure fuisse thurificantium probabuntur), fisco nostro associanda censemus. § 3. Sin vero in templis fanisve publicis, aut in aedibus agrisve alienis tale quispiam sacrificandi genus exercere tentaverit, si ignorante domino usurpata constiterit, xxv. librarum auri mulctae nomine cogetur inferre, conniventem vero huic sceleri par ac sacrificantem poena retinebit. § 4. Quod quidem ita per judices ac defensores et curiales singularum urbium volumus custodiri, ut illico per hos comperta in judicium deferantur, per illos delata plectantur. Si quid autem ii tegendum gratia, aut incuria praetermittendum esse crediderint, commotioni judiciariae subjacebunt. Illi vero moniti si vindictam dissimulatione distulerint, xxx. librarum auri dispendio mulctabuntur: officiis quoque eorum damno parili subjugandis. Dat. vi. Id. Nov. Constantinopoli, Arcadio. A. II. et Rufino Coss.

slavish tokens of subjection with which they resisted him had so little serious consequence,[14] that even heathen honours were offered to this zealous Christian emperor after his death.[15]

§ 79.

TOTAL SUPPRESSION OF PAGANISM IN THE EAST.—ITS STRUGGLE IN THE WEST AFTER THEODOSIUS.

Rüdiger l. c. p. 70 ss. Beugnot l. c. ii. 1 ss.

Paganism was at present only an external ceremonial, which retained its hold upon a few noble spirits with a feeling of patriotism; but with the mass, it was kept up merely from unreflecting custom or superstitious fear. Almost with all, however, its ancient doctrine was obliged to sink under the pressure of new ideas.[1] Hence the victory of Christianity over paganism inter-

[14] Comp. the narrative Prudent. in Symmachum i. 409 ss. Especially from 699 ss.:

> Adspice, quam pleno subsellia nostra senatu
> Decernant, infame Jovis pulvinar et omne
> Idolium longe purgata ex urbe fugandum;
> Qua vocat egregii sententia principis, illuc
> Libera tum pedibus, tum corde frequentia transit.

A different account, and one more accordant with later phenomena, is given by Zosimus iv. 59, in his representation of the effect of Theodosius's discourse in the senate: Μηδενὸς δὲ τῇ παρακλήσει πεισθέντος, μηδὲ ἐλομένου τῶν ἀφ' οὗπερ ἡ πόλις ᾠκίσθη παραδεδομένων αὐτοῖς πατρίων ἀναχωρῆσαι, καὶ προτιμῆσαι τούτων ἄλογον συγκατάθεσιν (ἐκεῖνα μὲν γὰρ φυλάξαντας ἤδη διακοσίοις καὶ χιλίοις σχεδὸν ἔτεσιν ἀπόρθητον τὴν πόλιν οἰκεῖν· ἕτερα δὲ ἀντὶ τούτων ἀλλαξαμένους τὸ ἐκβησόμενον ἀγνοεῖν)· τότε δὴ ὁ Θεοδόσιος βαρύνεσθαι τὸ δημόσιον ἔλεγε τῇ περὶ τὰ ἱερὰ καὶ τὰς θυσίας δαπάνῃ, βούλεσθαί τε ταῦτα περιελεῖν κ. τ. λ. (That is to say, the usurper Eugenius had given back again the legacies of the heathen sanctuaries (see note 3) which had been confiscated by Gratian. See Ambros. ep. 57. ad Eugenium). The consequence, Zosim. v. 38: Ὅτε Θεοδόσιος ὁ πρεσβύτης, τὴν Εὐγενίου καθελὼν τυραννίδα, τὴν Ῥώμην κατέλαβε, καὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἀγιστείας ἐνεποίησε πᾶσιν ὀλιγωρίαν, τὴν δημοσίαν δαπάνην τοῖς ἱεροῖς χορηγεῖν ἀρνησάμενος, ἀπηλαύνοντο μὲν ἱερεῖς καὶ ἱέρειαι, κατελιμπάνετο δὲ πάσης ἱερουργίας τὰ τεμένη.

[15] Beugnot i. 487. Hence the heathen poet Claudianus de tertio Consulatu Honorii v. 162 ss., who lived at this time, represents the death of the emperor as an ascent to the gods.

[1] Orosius hist. vi. 1: Deum quilibet hominum contemnere ad tempus potest, nescire in totum non potest. Unde quidam, dum in multis Deum credunt, multos Deos indiscreto timore finxerunt. Sed hinc jam vel

nally dead, could not be matter of doubt;[2] although the former often carried on the contest more by external means than by its inward power.[3] Many heathens could not resist the external

maxime, cum auctoritate veritatis operante, tum ipsa etiam ratione discutiente, discessum est. Quippe cum et philosophi eorum—unum Deum auctorem omnium repererunt, ad quem unum omnia referrentur; unde etiam nunc pagani, quos jam declarata veritas de contumacia magis quam de ignorantia convincit, cum a nobis discutiuntur, non se plures Deos sequi, sed sub uno Deo magno plures ministros venerari fatentur. Restat igitur de intelligentia veri Dei per multas intelligendi suspiciones confusa dissensio, quia de uno Deo omnium paene una opinio est. The heathen said (Augustini enarr. in Psalm 96. § 12.): Non colimus mala daemonia: Angelos quos dicitis, ipsos et nos colimus, virtutes Dei magni et ministeria Dei magni. The heathen grammarian, Maximus of Madaura, writes to Augustine (August. ep. 43): Olympum montem Deorum esse habitaculum, sub incerta fide Graecia fabulatur. At vero nostrae urbis forum salutarium numinum frequentia possessum nos cernimus et probamus. Equidem unum esse Deum summum sine initio, sine prole, naturae ceu patrem magnum atque magnificum, quis tam demens, tam mente captus neget esse certissimum? Hujus nos virtutes per mundanum opus diffusas multis vocabulis invocamus, quoniam nomen ejus cuncti, proprium videlicet, ignoramus. Nam Deus omnibus religionibus commune nomen est. Ita fit, ut, dum ejus quasi quaedam membra carptim variis supplicationibus prosequimur, totum colere profecto videamur. No one could endure that the Christian martyrs should be preferred to these deities, qui conscientia nefandorum facinorum, specie gloriosae mortis,—dignum moribus factisque suis exitum maculati reperiunt.—Sed mihi hac tempestate propemodum videtur bellum Actiacum rursus exortum, quo Aegyptia monstra in Romanorum Deos audeant tela vibrare, minime duratura. In Macrobii (about 410) Saturnalium i. 17. A praetextatus (comp. § 78. note 6) declares the sun to be the one supreme God. Si enim sol, ut veteribus placuit, dux et moderator est luminum reliquorum, et solus stellis errantibus praestat; ipsarum vero stellarum cursus ordinem rerum humanarum—pro potestate disponunt: —necesse est, ut solem, qui moderatur nostra moderantes, omnium, quae circa nos geruntur, fateamur auctorem. Et sicut Maro, cum de una Junone diceret, *Quo numine laeso*, ostendit, unius Dei effectus varios pro variis censendos esse numinibus; ita diversae virtutes solis nomina Diis dederunt; unde ἓν τὸ πᾶν sapientum principes prodiderunt.

[2] Chrysostomus de s. Babyla contra Julianum et gentiles § 3. (Opp. ed Montf. ii. 540), *ὑπ' οὐδενὸς ἐνοχληθεῖσά ποτε τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς δεισιδαιμονίας ἡ πλάνη ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς ἐσβέσθη, καὶ περὶ ἑαυτὴν διέπεσε, καθάπερ τῶν σωμάτων τὰ τηκηδόνι παραδοθέντα μακρᾷ, καὶ μηδενὸς αὐτὰ βλάπτοντος αὐτόματα φθείρεται, καὶ διαλυθέντα κατὰ μικρὸν ἀφανίζεται.*

[3] Augustinus in Evang. Joannis tract. 25. § 10: Quam multi non quaerunt Jesum nisi ut illis faciat bene secundum tempus! Alius negotium habet, quaerit intercessionem clericorum: alius premitur a potentiore, fugit ad ecclesiam. alius pro se vult interveniri apud eum, apud

advantages presented by it. Few were ready to suffer for their religion.[4] But it is true, that in this manner also the number of merely external Christians was increased—men who still entertained heathen modes of thought and disposition; and the value of Christianity was by no means so generally manifested in the practices of its confessors as before.[5]

In the empire of *the east* (*Arcadius* 395—408, *Theodosius* II. till 450), which was less disturbed from without, the ordinances of Theodosius against paganism could be strictly enforced.[6] Crowds of monks were sent about through the provinces with full power from the emperors, for the purpose of destroying all traces of idolatry.[7] Even misdeeds and murders were allowed to

quem parum valet: ille sic, ille sic: impletur quotidie talibus ecclesia. Vix quaeritur Jesus propter Jesum. cf. Id. de catechizandis rudibus c. 17. Hieronymus comm. in Isaiam lib. xvii.: Quod sequitur: Et venient ad te curvi,—qui detraxerant tibi (Es. lx. 14), de his debemus intelligere, qui non voluntate, sed necessitate sunt Christiani, et metu offensae regnantium timentibus animis inclinantur.

[4] Augustini enarr. in Psalm 141. § 20: Quis eorum comprehensus est in sacrificio, cum his legibus ista prohiberentur, et non negavit? Quis eorum comprehensus est adorare idolum, et non clamavit, non feci, et timuit ne convinceretur? Tales ministros Diabolus habebat. He then contrasts with them the steadfastness of the Christian martyrs. Chrysostom de. s. Babyla § 7 says of the heathen priests, *μᾶλλον δεσποτῶν καὶ τῶν εἰδώλων δὲ αὐτῶν τοὺς βασιλεῖς θεραπεύουσι*, and describes the neglected state in which the temples, altars, and images of the gods were, in consequence, under Christian emperors.

[5] Thus Augustinus enarr. in Psalm. 25. § 14 makes a heathen reply: Quid mihi persuades ut Christianus sim? Ego fraudem a Christiano passus sum, et nunquam feci: falsum mihi juravit Christianus, et ego numquam. Chrysostom. in i. epist. ad Tim. hom. x. § 3. (Opp. xi. 602): *Οὐδεὶς ἂν ἦν Ἕλλην, εἰ ἡμεῖς ὦμεν Χριστιανοί, ὡς δει.—Οὐδεὶς πρόσεισιν. οἱ γὰρ διδασκόμενοι πρὸς τὴν τῶν διδασκάλων ἀρετὴν ὁρῶσι. καὶ ὅταν ἴδωσι καὶ ἡμᾶς τῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιθυμοῦντας,—τοῦ ἄρχειν, τοῦ τιμᾶσθαι, πῶς δυνήσονται θαυμάσαι τὸν Χριστιανισμόν; Ὁρῶσι βίους ἐπιληψίμους, ψυχὰς γηΐνας κ. τ. λ.*

[6] Cod. Theod. xvi. 10, 13 ss. By L. 14 their privileges were taken from the priests.

[7] So Chrysostom (Theodoret. v. 29) *μαθὼν τὴν Φοινίκην ἔτι περὶ τὰς τῶν δαιμόνων τελετὰς μεμηνέναι, ἀσκητὰς μὲν ζήλῳ θείῳ πυρπολουμένους συνέλεξε, νόμοις δὲ αὐτοὺς ὁπλίσας βασιλικοῖς, κατὰ τῶν εἰδωλικῶν ἐξέπεμψε τεμένων.* These *νόμοι* are without doubt Cod. Theod. xvi. 10, 16 A.D. 399: Si qui in agris templa sunt, sine turba ac tumultu diruantur. cf. Chrysostom epistt. 28. 51. 53. 54. 55. 59. 69. 123. 126. 221. Chrysostom worked in the same way in other countries also. See Procli (Episc. Constantinop. 434—446) laudatio S. Jo Chrys. (orat. xx. in Combefisii nov. auctarium i. 468): In Epheso artem Midae nudavit, in Phrygia Matrem

pass unheeded by the emperors; such as the horrible murder of the female philosopher *Hypatia* in Alexandria (416).[8] The new platonic philosophers at Athens, and among them even the celebrated *Proclus* († 485),[9] were forced to conceal themselves most carefully, because they rejected Christianity. As early as 423, all visible traces of paganism had disappeared in the East.[10]

It was otherwise in *the west*, notwithstanding the want of all living attachment to paganism in this quarter of the world also. So little hold had it on the minds of the people, that even in Rome its continued centre, where many families of note were still heathen, and many of the highest places were still occupied by heathens,[11] sacrifices were totally discontinued, after the cost of public oblations had ceased to be defrayed by the state. Under the feeble reign of *Honorius* (395—423), the earlier laws against paganism still remained in force, and were even increased by the addition of several new enactments; but the emperor was obliged at times to limit their operation,[12] to acknowledge heathen priests as public officers,[13] and to put a check to the destruction of temples,[14] for the sake of preserving some degree of

quae dicebatur deorum sine filiis fecit, in Caesarea publicana meretricia honoris vacua despoliavit, in Syria Deum impugnantes Synagogas evacuavit, in Perside verbum pietatis seminavit.

[8] Socrates vii. 15. Damascius ap. Suidam s. v. Hypatia. The article Hypatia of Alexandria in E. Münch's vermischte hist. Schrifte. Bd. 1. Ludwigsburg 1828. 8.

[9] Vita Procli scriptore Marino ed. J. A. Fabricius. Hamb. 1700. 8. His 18 ἐπιχειρήματα κατὰ Χριστιανῶν are contained and refuted in Johannis Philoponi libb. 18. de aeternitate mundi (graece ex Trincavelli officina. Venet. 1535. fol. lat. vert. Joh. Mahatius. Lugd. 1557. fol.)

[10] Theodosius ii. in Cod. Theodos. xvi. 10, 22. (A.D. 423): Paganos, qui supersunt, quanquam jam nullos esse credamus, promulgatarum legum jamdudum praescripta compescant.

[11] Thus Florentinus 397 and Flavianus A.D. 399 were Praef. urbis, Valerius Messala 396 Praef. praet. Italiae, Atticus Consul 397 (Beugnot ii. 6). Praefecti urbis were Rutilius Numatianus 413, Albinus 414, Symmachus A.D. 418: Praef. praet. Ital. 429 Volusianus (l. c. p. 127).

[12] Honorius had issued in the year 408 the law Cod. Theod. xvi. 5, 42: Eos qui Catholicae sectae sunt inimici, intra palatium militare prohibemus. Nullus nobis sit aliqua ratione conjunctus, qui a nobis fide et religione discordat. But when he afterwards wished to nominate the heathen Generidus commander in Rhoetia, the latter did not undertake the office ἕως ὁ βασιλεὺς, αἰδοῖ τε ἅμα καὶ χρείᾳ συνωθούμενος, ἔπαυσεν ἐπὶ πᾶσι τὸν νόμον, ἀποδοὺς ἑκάστῳ, τῆς αὐτοῦ ὄντι δόξης, ἄρχειν τε καὶ στρατεύεσθαι. Zosimus v. 46.

[13] Cod. Theod. xii. i. 166 ad Pompejanum Procons. Africae A.D. 400.

[14] The African bishops resolved at the Concil. Africanum A.D. 399 to

tranquillity. The struggle, however, between Christianity and paganism often proceeded here and there to acts of violence, in which the one party prevailed at one time, the other at another.[15] As the heathens had always been accustomed to lay the blame of all misfortune on the Christians; so since the west of Europe had been inundated by barbarous people, and even Italy had been several times devastated by such hordes, they were especially loud in declaring all these disasters to be punishments sent by the gods,[16] and in predicting the speedy downfall

make the following propositions to the emperors, Can. 25 (Cod. Eccl. Afric. c. 58. Mansi iii. p. 766): ut reliquias idolorum per totam Africam jubeant penitus amputari—et templa eorum, quae in agris vel in locis abditis constituta nullo ornamento sunt, jubeantur omnimodo destrui. Can. 27 (Cod. Afric. c. 60): ut quoniam contra praecepta divina convivia multis in locis exercentur, quae ab errore gentili attracta sunt —vetari talia jubeant, &c. But after this Honorius A.D. 399 enacted two laws of an opposite character, Cod. Theodos. lib. xvi. tit. 10, l. 17: Ut profanos ritus jam salubri lege submovimus, ita festos conventus civium et communem omnium laetitiam non patimur submoveri. L. 18: Aedes, inlicitis rebus vacuas, nostrarum beneficio sanctionum, ne quis conetur evertere.

[15] Regarding the destruction of temples which Martin, bishop of Tours, A.D. 375—400, undertook with violent opposition on the part of the heathen, see Sulpic. Severus de vita b. Martini c. 13—15. In Anaunia, a valley of the Rhoetian Alps, the missionaries Sisinnius, Martyrius, and Alexander, were horribly murdered A.D. 397 by the heathens during the Pagan festival of the Ambarvalia, and the church built by them destroyed. See Acta SS. (ad. d. 29 Maj.) Maji T. vii. p. 38. In Suffecte, in Africa, the Christians had demolished a statue of Hercules, and the heathens killed sixty of them for it (August. ep. 268 ad Suffectanos). How at Calama, in Numidia, the heathens, during one of their festivals in the year 408, attacked the church there, and persecuted the Christians, may be seen in Augustin. ep. 202 ad Nectarium.

[16] When the Gothic king Rhadegaisus 405 broke into Italy, the heathens said (Augustin. de civ. Dei v. 23), quod ille diis amicis protegentibus et opitulantibus, quibus immolare quotidie ferebatur, vinci omnino non posset ab eis, qui talia diis Romanis sacra non facerent, nec fieri a quoquam permitterent. When Rome was subsequently besieged by Alaric, 409 (Sozom. ix. 6), *ἀναγκαῖον ἐδόκει τοῖς ἑλληνίζουσι τῆς συγκλήτου, θύειν ἐν τῷ Καπιτωλίῳ καὶ τοις ἄλλοις ναοῖς.* And Zosimus v. 41 asserts: *ὁ δὲ Ἰννοκέντιος τὴν τῆς πόλεως σωτηρίαν ἔμπροσθεν τῆς οἰκείας ποιησάμενος δόξης, λάθρα ἐφῆκεν αὐτοῖς ποιεῖν ἅπερ ἴσασιν.* Comp. Beugnot ii. 55. Zosimus iv. 59: *τοῦ θυηπολικοῦ θεσμοῦ λήξαντος, καὶ τἀν ἄλλων, ὅσα τῆς πατρίου παραδόσεως ἦν, ἐν ἀμελείᾳ κειμένων, ἡ Ῥωμαίων ἐπικράτεια κατὰ μέρος ἐλαττωθεῖσα, βαρβάρων οἰκητήριον γέγονε, ἢ καὶ τέλεον ἐκπεσοῦσα τῶν οἰκητόρων εἰς τοῦτο κατέστη σχήματος, ὥστε μηδὲ τοὺς τόπους, ἐν οἷς γεγόνασιν αἱ πόλεις, ἐπιγινώσκειν.*

of Christianity.[17] Against these accusations the writings of *Augustine*[18] and the Spanish presbyter *Orosius*[19] could do but

[17] Many Christians believed that Christ should return 365 years after his first appearance, and the end of the world take place. Philastr. haer. 106: Alia est haeresis de anno annunciato ambigens, quod ait Propheta Esaias: Annuntiare annum Dei acceptabilem et diem retributionis. Putant ergo quidam, quod ex quo venit Dominus usque ad consummationem saeculi non plus nec minus fieri annorum numerum, nisi ccclxv. usque ad Christi Domini iterum de caelo divinam praesentiam. To this Christian expectation the heathen gave another application. Augustin. de civ. Dei xviii. 53: Excogitaverunt nescio quos versus Graecos tanquam consulenti cuidam divino oraculo effusos, ubi Christum quidem ab hujus tanquam sacrilegii crimine faciunt innocentem, Petrum autem maleficia fecisse subjungunt (namely, scelere magico puer, ut dicunt, anniculus occisus, et dilaniatus, et ritu nefario sepultus est), ut coleretur Christi nomen per ccclxv. annos, deinde completo memorato numero annorum sine mora sumeret finem. In the work de promissionibus et praedictionibus Dei lib. (inserted in Prosper's works, and written by an African about 450), it is related, P. iii. prom. 38, how the bishop Aurelius at Carthage had converted the long-closed temple of Caelestis (the Phoenician Astarte) into a Christian church, which, however, soon after (420) had been destroyed for the purpose of obviating a heathen illusion. Cum a quodam pagano falsum vaticinium, velut ejusdem Caelestis proferretur, quo rursum et via et templa prisco sacrorum ritui redderentur—verus Deus—sub Constantio et Augusta Placidia, quorum nunc filius Valentinus pius et christianus imperat, Urso insistente tribuno, omnia illa ad solum usque perducta agrum reliquit in sepulturam scilicet mortuorum.

[18] Augustin. retractat. ii. 43. Interea Roma Gothorum irruptione agentium sub rege Alarico, utque impetu magnae cladis eversa est, cujus eversionem deorum falsorum multorumque cultores, quos usitato nomine Paganos vocamus, in christianam religionem referre conantes, solito acerbius et amarius Deum verum blasphemare coeperunt. Unde ergo exardescens zelo domus Dei, adversus eorum blasphemias vel errores libros de civitate Dei scribere institui. Hoc autem de civitate Dei grande opus tandem xxii. libris est terminatum. Quorum quinque primi eos refellunt, qui res humanas ita prosperari volunt, ut ad hoc multorum deorum cultum, quos Pagani colere consueverunt, necessarium esse arbitrentur: et quia prohibetur, mala ista exoriri atque abundare contendunt. Sequentes autem quinque adversus eos loquuntur, qui fatentur haec mala nec defuisse unquam, nec defutura mortalibus, et ea nunc magna, nunc parva, locis, temporibus, personisque variari, sed deorum multorum cultum, quo eis sacrificatur, propter vitam post mortem futuram esse utilem disputant. His ergo decem libris duae istae vanae opiniones christianae religioni adversariae refelluntur. Sed ne quisquam nos aliena tantum redarguisse, non autem nostra asseruisse reprehenderet, id agit pars altera operis hujus, quae libris xii. continetur. Duodecim ergo librorum sequentium primi quatuor continent exortum duarum civitatum, quarum est una Dei, altera hujus mundi. Secundi quatuor excursum earum sive procursum. Tertii vero, qui et postremi, debitos fines. Augustini de

little; but they must have become dumb of themselves when even the German conquerors became converts to Christianity, and persecuted heathenism.[20] Hence even *Valentinian* III. (423—455), with all his powerlessness, could appear again as a decided opponent to paganism.[21] Still it was kept up more or less privately amid the confusion of migrations.[22] Particular

civitate Dei libb. xxii. cum commentario Jo. Lud. Vivis. Basil. 1522. fol. cum comm. Leon. Coquaei. Paris 1636. fol. cum comm. Vivis et Coquaei sumt. Zach. Hertelii. Hamburg. 1661. 2 Tom. 4. Jo. van Goens disp. hist. theol. de Aurel. Augustino Apologeta secundum libros de civitate Dei. Amstelod. 1838. 8.

[19] Pauli Orosii adversus Paganos historiarum libb. vii. rec. et illustr. Sigeb. Havercampus. Lugd. Bat. 1738. 4. Th. de Moerner de Orosii vita ejusque hist. libris. Berol. 1844. 8.

[20] So the Goths under Alaric at the sacking of Rome 410 (Augustin. de civ. Dei v. 23), qui—ad loca sancta confugientes, christianae religionis reverentia, tuerentur, ipsisque daemonibus atque impiorum sacrificiorum ritibus—sic adversarentur pro nomine christiano, ut longe atrocius bellum cum eis quam cum hominibus gerere viderentur. cf. i. 1.

[21] Cod. Theod. xvi. 5, 63, A.D. 425: Omnes haereses omnesque perfidias, omnia schismata superstitionesque gentilium, omnes catholicae legis inimicos insectamur errores. It is decreed, sacrilegae superstitionis auctores, participes. conscios proscriptione plectendos.

[22] So in upper Italy Maximus Ep. Taurinensis (about 440, ed. Rom. 1784. fol.) Serm. 96, p. 655: Ante dies commonueram caritatem vestram, fratres, ut—idolorum omnem pollutionem de vestris possessionibus auferretis, et erueretis ex agris universum gentilium errorem. Nec se aliquis excusatum putet, dicens, non jussi fieri, non mandavi—tacendo enim, et non arguendo consensum praebuit immolanti—.Tu igitur, frater, cum tuum sacrificare rusticum cernis, nec prohibes immolare, peccas. Cum cellam ingressus fueris, reperies in ea pallentes cespites, mortuosque carbones. Et si ad agrum processeris, cernis aras ligneas et simulacra lapidea. Cum maturius vigilaveris, et videris saucium vino rusticum, scire debes, quoniam, sicut dicunt, aut dianaticus (a worshipper of Diana), aut aruspex est:—talis enim sacerdos parat se vino ad plagas deae suae, ut dum est ebrius poenam suam ipse non sentiat. Nam ut paulisper describamus habitum vatis hujusce: est ei adulterinis criniculis hirsutum caput, nuda habens pectora, pallio crura semicincta, et more gladiatorum —ferrum gestat in manibus, nisi quod gladiatore pejor est, quia ille adversus alterum dimicare cogitur, iste contra se pugnare compellitur. So also Maximus contra Paganos (Opp. p. 721) is directed against the still existing idolatry. Comp. his Sermo 77 p. 610: Principes quidem tam boni christiani leges pro religione promulgant, sed eas executores non exerunt competenter. In Gaul Conc. Arelat. ii. ann. 443 c. 23: Si in alicujus Episcopi territorio infideles aut faculas accendunt, aut arbores, fontes vel saxa venerantur, si hoc eruere neglexerit, sacrilegii reum se esse cognoscat. Here persecutions of the Christians must still have taken place once and again, for chapter 10 contains penitence-decisions de his qui in persecutione praevaricati sunt, si voluntarie fidem negave-

heathen customs, which had become of value to the people or had gained their superstitious confidence, were maintained, notwithstanding all the conversions to Christianity.[23]

rint; and chapter 11 respecting those, qui dolore victi et pondere persecutionis negare vel sacrificare compulsi sunt. In Africa: De promiss. et praedict. Dei libb. P. iii. prom. 38 (comp. above note 17): Novi quoque ipse, in quadam parte Mauretaniae provinciae de spelaeis et cavernis ita antiqua producta simulacra, quae fuerant absconsa, ut omnis illa cum clericis in sacrilegio perjurii civitas teneretur. In Corsica Paganism continued predominant, and sacrifices were publicly offered. A female Christian named Julia was crucified by the exasperated heathens (between 440—445), because she would not take part in a sacrifice. See Acta SS. Maj. viii. 167 (ad 22, Maj.)

[23] In Rome, even such practices as had a certain political importance were kept up. See Salvianus (presbyter in Marseilles about 440. Salv. et Vincent. Lir. opp. ed. Baluzius. Paris 1684, 8. Bremae 1688, 4). de gubernatione Dei lib. vi. ed. Brem. p. 106: Numquid, non Consulibus et pulli adhuc gentilium sacrilegorum more pascuntur, et volantis pennae auguria quaeruntur, ac paene omnia fiunt, quae etiam illi quondam pagani veteres frivola atque irridenda duxerunt?—haec propter Consules tantum fiunt. The fights with wild beasts were continued, Salvianus vi. p. 105: Nihil ferme vel criminum, vel flagitiorum est, quod in spectaculis non sit; ubi summum deliciarum genus est mori homines, aut, quod est morte gravius acerbiusque, lacerari, expleri ferarum alvos humanis carnibus, comedi homines cum circumstantium laetitia, conspicientium voluptate.—Atque ut hoc fiat, orbis impendium est; magna enim cura id agitur et elaboratur.—Sed haec, inquis, non semper fiunt. Certum est, et praeclara erroris est excusatio, quia non semper fiunt! p. 113: Si quando evenerit,—ut eodem die et festivitas ecclesiastica et ludi publici agantur, quaero ab omnium conscientia, quis locus majores christianorum virorum copias habeat, cavea ludi publici, an atrium Dei? —Non solum ad Ecclesiam non veniunt qui Christianos se esse dicunt; sed si qui inscii forte venerint, dum in ipsa Ecclesia sunt, si ludos agi audiunt, Ecclesiam derelinquunt.—Maximus Taurin. hom. C. p. 334: ante dies plerosque—circa vesperum tanta vociferatio populi extitit, ut irreligiositas ejus penetraret ad caelum. Quod cum requirerem, quid sibi clamor hic velit; dixerunt mihi, quod laboranti lunae vestra vociferatio subveniret, et defectum ejus suis clamoribus adjuvaret. It was believed (Hom. ci. p. 337,) lunam de caelo magorum carminibus posse deduci. The heathen festival of the Kalendae Januariae was universally observed. Ambrose, Augustine, Leo the Great, and Peter Chrysologus, bishop of Ravenna, express themselves with zeal against it: also Maximus hom. ciii. p. 343: Quis sapiens, qui dominici Natalis sacramentum colit, non ebrietatem condemnet Saturnalium, non declinet lasciviam Kalendarum?—Sunt plerique, qui trahentes consuetudinem de veteri superstitione vanitatis, Kalendarum diem pro summa festivitate procurent.—Nam ita lasciviunt, ita vino et epulis satiantur, ut qui toto anno castus et temperans fuerit, illa die sit temulentus atque pollutus.—Illud autem quale est, quod surgentes mature ad publicum cum munus-

SECOND CHAPTER.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

J. Chr. F. Wundemann Gesch. d. christl. Glaubenslehren vom Zeitalter des Athanasius bis auf Gregor. d. G. 2 Theile. Lpz. 1798. 99. 8.—Munscher's Dogmengeschichte. Bd. 3 and 4.

§ 80.

INTRODUCTION.

The universally received articles of the Christian faith in the beginning of this century were still so simple as to admit of very different modes of interpretation, and afford a wide province to reason for free inquiry. How manifold were the theological views which arose, may be seen particularly from a comparison of the different schools, the speculative Origenist, the traditional, and the historico-exegetical, which now first began. And a still greater contrast of systems might be expected from the inclination of the Greek Christians to speculation and argument,[1] when external tranquillity was afforded them, after the cessation of persecution.

Thus theological controversies were unavoidable, though they would have had none other than a salutary influence on the development of reason, if parties had abided by the old distinction between πίστις and γνῶσις with clear consciousness; and if debated questions belonging to theology had not been drawn into the province of religion and the church. But the very simplicity of

culo h. e. cum strenis unusquisque procedit, et salutaturus amicos, salutat praemio antequam osculo? caet. Most striking is that which Salvianus de gub. Dei viii. p. 165, writes of Africa: Quis non eorum, qui Christiani appellabantur, Caelestem illam (see not. 17) aut post Christum adoravit, aut, quod est pejus multo, ante quam Christum? Quis non daemoniacorum sacrificiorum nidore plenus, divinae domus limen introiit, et cum foetore ipsorum daemonum Christi altare conscendit?—Ecce quae Afrorum, et maxime nobilissimorum, fides, quae religio, quae christianitas fuit!—At, inquis, non omnes ista faciebant, sed potentissimi quique, ac sublimissimi. Adquiescamus hoc ita esse. caet.

[1] Cicero de orat. i. 11: Graeculos homines contentionis cupidiores quam veritatis.

the older articles of faith frequently invited the disputants to appeal to them in their own favour, and so to accuse their opponents of deviating from the faith. If the accused also, wished to lay claim for themselves to that freedom of speculation on the basis of the πίστις, the hierarchy on the other hand was a natural enemy to such liberty as should withdraw itself from its guardianship of any department affecting the church, and had of course an interest in bringing all theological matters of debate from the province of theology into the province of religious faith, in order to be able to lay claim to the right of deciding. This interest now appeared the more regardless in proportion as opposition to the heathen ceased to be a formidable thing, requiring a forbearing patience within the church, while the hierarchy was now supported by worldly power. Thus religious controversies assumed at the present time a very different character. While they were *formerly* limited to particular provinces, the whole Christian world was *now* divided by theological disputes into two parties. To put an end to the division by a final ecclesiastical decision the emperors called *general councils*, (σύνοδοι οἰκουμενικαί), elevated their decisions into laws of the realm, and applied worldly power to enforce them universally. In earlier times, the councils summoned against heretics contented themselves merely with warding off the false doctrine by denials; but now the general councils, feeling their ecclesiastical importance, and supported by the imperial power, began to exalt positive decisions regarding disputed points, into ecclesiastical articles of faith.[2] Thus the development of doctrines proceeded rashly and rapidly, while the field left to free speculation was always narrowed in proportion. On this very account too, opponents presented a much more obstinate opposition, and the schisms became greater and more incurable. The struggle had the most important influence on the development of the internal

[2] Hilarius de trinitate ii. 1: Sufficiebat quidem credentibus Dei sermo, —cum dicit Dominus: Euntes nunc docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti, &c.—Sed compellimur haereticorum et blasphemantium vitiis illicita agere, ardua scandere, ineffabilia eloqui, inconcessa praesumere. Et cum sola fide expleri quae praecepta sunt oporteret, adorare scilicet Patrem. et venerari cum eo Filium, sancto Spiritu abundare: cogimur sermonis nostri humilitatem ad ea quae inenarrabilia sunt extendere, et in vitium vitio coarctamur alieno; ut quae contineri religione mentium oportuisset, nunc in periculum humani eloquii proferantur.

relations of the church, and was even of great political moment, from the circumstance of the emperors themselves taking a share in it. Hence from this time forward, the history of theological disputes forms the central point not only of the whole history of the church, but sometimes also of the political history of the Roman empire.

I. PERIOD OF THE ARIAN DISPUTES.

Walch's Historie der Ketzereien ii. 385 ff. J. A. Möhler's Athanasius d. Grosse u. d. Kirche seiner Zeit, bes. im Kampfe mit dem Arianismus. 2 Th. Mainz 1827. 8. Baur's Lehre von d. Dreieinigkeit u. Menschwerdung Gottes in ihrer geschichtl. Entwickelung i. 320. G. A. Meier's Lehre von der Trinität in ihrer histor. Entwickelung i. 134. Ritter's Gesch. d. christl. Philosophie ii. 18.

§ 81.

BEGINNING OF THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY TO THE SYNOD OF NICE, (325).

Storia critica della vita di Arrio, scritta da Gaetano Maria Travasa, Cler. Reg. Teatino. Venezia 1746. 8. Der Arianismus in s. ursprungl. Bedeutung u. Richtung von L. Lange, in Illgen's Zeitschr. f. d. hist. Theol. iv. ii. 75.

While endeavours were made in vain to reunite the Donatists and Meletians with the church, the progressive development of the doctrine of the Logos gave rise to a new controversy, which soon became more general and violent than any that had preceded it. The common doctrine of the Logos, after the expulsion of the Monarchians, was, that he is the mediator of all Divine agency in the finite, by the will of the Father, and less than He. Regarding his origin, the emanistic idea had been by far the most general. In opposition to it, the school of Origen represented him as an eternal ray of the Divine glory. This bringing forth of the Logos from the Divine essence by the will of the Father, was still however a creation; and that this creating could not be eternal, had been already perceived, when Dionysius of Alexandria, in opposition to Sabellius, gave greater prominence to the fact that the Son was created.[1] But the ema-

[1] See Divis. i. § 64, notes 7, 8, § 66, note 16. The Romish Dionysius merely infers from the expressions of the Alexandrian the non-eternity

nists also took offence at this conclusion; for with them the Logos was eternal, though not as a person, yet still in the essence of God from whom he had proceeded. Dionysius at that time prevented a controversy by yielding; but now *Arius*, a presbyter in Alexandria, who, in the school of Lucian by a historico-exegetical training had received the love of intelligible clearness, wished to remove the latent contradiction in Origen's doctrine, by teaching that the Logos is a created, and consequently not an eternal being.[2] When he fell into a dispute with his

of the Logos; the latter denies it; a proof that he did not express it as his opinion. If, however, the Logos was a creature, he was not eternal. Hence the Arians referred even to Dionysius in favour of this doctrine. See § 14, note 7. Athanasius de sententia Dionysii endeavours to excuse him; but Basil the Great Ep. ix. 2, finds in him the germ of Arianism.

[2] Writings of Arius: Epist. ad Eusebium Nicomediensem ap. Epiphan. haer. 69, § 6, and Theodoret. hist. eccl. 1, 4, Epist. Alexandrum ap. Athanasius de synodis Arim. et Seleuc. c. 16, and Epiphanius haer. 69, § 7, Θαλεία (ἐμφερὴς τῇ χαυνότητι τοῖς Σωτάδου ᾄσμασιν Sozom. i. 21), not extant except fragments in Athanasius. According to Athanasius c. Arian. Or. ii. 24, Arius, Eusebius, and Asterius, in their works, inculcated these sentiments respecting the creation of the world ὡς ἄρα θέλων ὁ θεὸς τὴν γενητὴν κτίσαι φύσιν, ἐπειδὴ ἐώρα μὴ δυναμένην αὐτὴν μετασχεῖν τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς ἀκράτου (χειρὸς), καὶ τὴς παρ' αὐτοῦ δημιουργίας, ποιεῖ καὶ κτίζει πρώτως μόνος μόνον ἕνα καὶ καλεῖ τοῦτον υἱόν καί λόγον, ἵνα τούτου μέσου γενομένου οὕτως λοιπὸν καὶ τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι δυνηθῇ. Arius's own explanations Epist. ad Euseb. ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγέννητος, οὐδὲ μέρος ἀγεννήτου κατ' οὐδένα τρόπον, οὐδὲ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου τινός· ἀλλ' ὅτι θελήματι καὶ βουλῇ ὑπέστη πρὸ χρόνων καὶ πρὸ αἰώνων πλήρης θεὸς, μονογενὴς, ἀναλλοίωτος, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῇ, ἤτοι κτισθῇ, ἢ ὁρισθῇ, ἢ θεμελιωθῇ, οὐκ ἦν· ἀγέννητος γὰρ οὐκ ἦν. διωκόμεθα, ὅτι εἴπαμεν, ἀρχὴν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς, ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἄναρχός ἐστι. διὰ τοῦτο διωκόμεθα. καὶ ὅτι εἴπαμεν, ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐστίν. οὕτω δὲ εἴπαμεν, καθότι οὐδὲ μέρος θεοῦ, οὐδὲ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου τινός. Epist. ad Alex. οἴδαμεν ἕνα θεὸν, μόνον ἀγέννητον—, τοῦτον θεὸν γεννήσαντα υἱὸν μονογενῆ πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, δι' οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ πεποίηκε· γεννήσαντα δὲ οὐ δοκήσει, ἀλλ' ἀληθείᾳ, ὑποστήσαντα δὲ ἰδίῳ θελήματι, ἄτρεπτον καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον, κτίσμα τοῦ θεοῦ τέλειον, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἓν τῶν κτισμάτων, γέννημα, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἓν τῶν γεννημάτων, οὐδ' ὡς Οὐαλεντῖνος προβολὴν τὸ γέννημα τοῦ πατρὸς ἐδογμάτισεν, οὐδ' ὡς ὁ Μανιχαῖος μέρος ὁμοούσιον τοῦ πατρὸς τὸ γέννημα εἰσηγήσατο, οὐδ' ὡς Σαβέλλιος τὴν μονάδα διαιρῶν, υἱοπάτορα εἶπεν, οὐδ' ὡς Ἱεράκας λύχνον ἀπὸ λύχνου, ἢ ὡς λαμπάδα εἰς δύο, οὐδὲ τὸν ὄντα πρότερον, ὕστερον γεννηθέντα, ἢ ἐπικτισθέντα εἰς υἱόν·— ἀλλ' ὡς φαμὲν, θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸ χρόνων καὶ πρὸ αἰώνων κτισθέντα, καὶ τὸ ζῆν καὶ τὸ εἶναι παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς εἰληφότα, καὶ τὰς δόξας συνυποστήσαντος αὐτῷ τοῦ πατρός. οὐ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ, δοὺς αὐτῷ πάντων τὴν κληρονομίαν, ἐστέρησεν ἑαυτὸν, ὧν ἀγεννήτως ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ. πηγὴ γάρ ἐστι πάντων. Ὥστε τρεῖς εἰσιν ὑποστάσεις, καὶ ὁ μὲν θεὸς αἴτιος τῶν πάντων τυγχάνων, ἔστιν ἄναρχος μονώτατος. ὁ δὲ υἱὸς ἀχρόνως γεννηθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ πρὸ αἰώνων κτισθεὶς καὶ θεμελιωθεὶς, οὐκ ἦν πρὸ τοῦ γεννηθῆναι·—οὐδὲ γάρ ἐστιν

bishop *Alexander* on the point (318), who excluded him and his followers from church-fellowship, many bishops in Syria and Asia Minor declared themselves in favour of Arius; some, especially *Eusebius,* bishop of *Nicomedia* (Συλλουκιανιστά Arius ad Euseb. ap. Theodoret. I, 4, see above § 65, note 5), because they adopted his views; others, as *Eusebius,* bishop of *Caesarea,*[3] because they held that the faith of the church was at least not violated by the doctrine of Arius. The most important writer who endeavoured to defend the Arian principles was the sophist *Asterius* of Cappadocia, also a disciple of Lucian († about 330).[4] Thus the controversy communicated itself to the whole east. After Constantine had in vain endeavoured to induce the contending parties to give up the dispute, by rational representations,[5] he

ἀίδιος, ἢ συναΐδιος, ἢ συναγέννητος τῷ πατρί.—εἰ δὲ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ ἐκ γαστρὸς, καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἦκω, ὡς μέρος αὐτοῦ ὁμοούσιον, καὶ ὡς προβολὴ ὑπό τινων νοεῖται, σύνθετος ἔσται ὁ πατὴρ καὶ διαίρετος, καὶ τρεπτὸς, καὶ σῶμα κατ' αὐτοὺς, καὶ τὸ ὅσον ἐπ' αὐτοῖς τὰ ἀκόλουθα σώματι πάσχων, ὁ ἀσώματος Θεός. From the Thaleia (ap. Athanas. contra Arianos Orat. ii. c. 9): οὐκ ἀεὶ ὁ Θεὸς πατὴρ ἦν, ἀλλ' ὕστερον γέγονεν. οὐκ ἀεὶ ἦν ὁ υἱὸς, οὐ γὰρ ἦν, πρὶν γεννηθῇ. οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, ἀλλ' ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ὑπέστη καὶ αὐτός. οὐκ ἔστιν ἴδιος τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας, κτίσμα γάρ ἐστι καὶ ποίημα. καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς ὁ Χριστός, ἀλλὰ μετοχῇ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐθεοποιήθη· οὐκ οἶδε τὸν πατέρα ἀκριβῶς ὁ υἱὸς, οὔτε ὁρᾷ ὁ λόγος τὸν πατέρα τελείως, καὶ οὔτε συνιεῖ, οὔτε γινώσκει ἀκριβῶς ὁ λόγος τὸν πατέρα· οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς καὶ μόνος αὐτὸς τοῦ πατρὸς λόγος, ἀλλ' ὀνόματι μόνον λέγεται λόγος καὶ σοφία, καὶ χάριτι λέγεται υἱὸς καὶ δύναμις· οὐκ ἔστιν ἄτρεπτος, ὡς ὁ πατὴρ, ἀλλὰ τρεπτός ἐστι φύσει, ὡς τὰ κτίσματα, καὶ λείπει αὐτῷ εἰς κατάληψιν τοῦ γνῶναι τελείως τὸν πατέρα. When the Son is sometimes called τρεπτός sometimes ἄτρεπτος, that is explained by a preceding fragment (Orat. ii. c. 5): τῇ μὲν φύσει, ὥσπερ πάντες, οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ λόγος ἐστὶ τρεπτὸς, τῷ δὲ ἰδίῳ αὐτεξουσίῳ, ἕως βούλεται, μένει καλός. ὅτε μέντοι θέλει, δύναται τρέπεσθαι καὶ αὐτὸς, ὥσπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς, τρεπτῆς ὢν φύσεως. Διὰ τοῦτο γάρ, φησι, καὶ προγινώσκων ὁ Θεὸς ἔσεσθαι καλὸν αὐτὸν, προλαβὼν ταύτην αὐτῷ τὴν δόξαν δέδωκεν, ἣν ἂν καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἔσχε μετὰ ταῦτα.

[3] Comp. the fragment of his letter to Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, in the Acts of the Conc. Nicaeni ii. ann. 787. Actio vi. ap. Mansi xiii. p. 316.

[4] Fragments of his σύνταγμα in Athanasius.

[5] Epist. Constantini ad Alexandrum et Arium in Eusebii vit. Const. ii. 64—72. Among other things we find c. 69: οὔτε ἐρωτᾶν ὑπὲρ τῶν τοιούτων ἐξ ἀρχῆς προσῆκον ἦν, οὔτε ἐρωτώμενον ἀποκρίνεσθαι. τὰς γὰρ τοιαύτας ζητήσεις, ὁπόσας μὴ νόμου τινὸς ἀνάγκη προστάττει, ἀλλ' ἀνωφελοῦς ἀργίας ἐρεσχελία προστίθησιν, εἰ καὶ φυσικῆς τινος γυμνασίας ἕνεκα γίγνοιτο, ὁμως ὀφείλομεν εἴσω τῆς διανοίας ἐγκλείειν, καὶ μὴ προχείρως εἰς δημοσίας συνόδους ἐκφέρειν, μηδὲ ταῖς τῶν δήμων ἀκοαῖς ἀπρονόητως πιστεύειν.—c. 70. Διόπερ καὶ ἐρωτησις ἀπροφύλακτος, καὶ ἀπόκρισις ἀπρονόητος ἴσην ἀλλήλαις αἰτιδότωσαν ἐφ' ἑκατέρῳ συγγιώμην.—c. 71. Καὶ λέγω ταῦτα, οὐχ ὡς

called *the first oecumenical council at Nice* (325).[6] As the number of Arian bishops was much smaller than that of their opponents, the party of Alexander prevailed, their cause being pleaded by *Athanasius*, deacon in Alexandria, and *Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra*. The Arian doctrine was rejected; but the ancient emanistic notion was confirmed, and was merely developed farther by the decision that the Son is of the same essence with the Father (*ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρί*).[7] This expression, which had been till

ἀναγκάζων ὑμᾶς ἐξάπαντος τῇ λίαν εὐήθει, καὶ οἵα δή ποτέ ἐστιν ἐκείνη ἡ ζήτησις, συντίθεσθαι. δύναται γὰρ καὶ τὸ τῆς συνόδου τίμιον ὑμῖν ἀκεραίως σώζεσθαι, καὶ μία καὶ ἡ αὐτὴ κατὰ πάντων κοινωνία τηρεῖσθαι, κἂν τὰ μάλιστά τις ἐν μέρει πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὑμῖν ὑπὲρ ἐλαχίστου διαφωνία γένηται.

[6] According to Eusebius de vita Constantini this council numbered more than 250 bishops. In later times 318 were usually reckoned to it, and it was called the council *οἱ τιή*. The first persons who have the latter number expressly refer to the 318 servants of Abraham, in whom Barnabas, so early as his day, had found a prediction relating to Christ, c. 9, Hilary de synodis c. 86: et mihi quidem ipse ille numerus hic sanctus est, in quo Abraham victor regum impiorum ab eo, qui aeterni sacerdotii est forma, benedicitur. Liberius ap. Socrat. iv. 2. Ambrosius de fide lib. i. prolog. § 5. Doubtless this sacred number was arbitrarily assumed for the purpose of conferring honour on the council of the Nicenes. Gelasius, however, hist. Conc. Nic. and an anonymous author in the Spicilegium Romanum t. vi. (Romae 1841. 8.) p. 608, give the number 300.

[7] The history of the Nicene Synod, written by Maruthas, bishop of Tagrit in Mesopotamia, at the end of the fourth century (see Assemani bibl. orient. t. i. p. 195), is no longer extant. Gelasii Cyziceni (bishop of Caesarea in Palestine about 476) *σύνταγμα τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐν Νικαίᾳ ἁγίαν σύνοδον πραχθέντων* libb. 3. (the third lost) prim. ed. Rob. Balforeus Scotus. Paris. 1600. 8. also in the collection of the decrees of councils ap. Mansi ii. p. 759. (translated in Fuchs i. 416.)—Th. Ittigii historia Concilii Nicaeni (ed. Christianus Ludovici). Lips. 1712. 4. Fuchs Bibliothek der Kirchenversammlungen des vierten u. fünften Jahrh i. 350.—Symbolum Nicaenum (cf. Chr. G. F. Walchii bibliotheca symbolica vetus. Lemgov. 1770. 8. p. 75 ss.): *Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ, τουτέστιν, ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα, οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί. δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τά τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ. τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα, καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, παθόντα καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς, καὶ ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, ὅτι ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν, τρεπτὸν, ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία.* Concerning the composition of this creed: Athanasius epist. de decretis synodi Nicaenae, and

now regarded as Sabellian, was very suspicious in the eyes of the oriental bishops.[8] The most of them however yielded to the imperial authority, and subscribed the new creed.[9] None but the two Egyptian bishops *Theonas* and *Secundus* refused, who were therefore banished with *Arius* to Illyria. The Nicene decrees were universally proclaimed as imperial law; and when the bishops *Eusebius of Nicomedia*, and *Theognis of Nice*, departed from them, they were sent into exile to Gaul (325).

§ 82.

OPPOSITION OF THE EUSEBIANS TO THE NICENE COUNCIL TILL THE SECOND SYNOD AT SIRMIUM (357.)

H. J. Wetzer, restitutio veræ chronologiæ rerum ex controversiis Arianis inde ab anno 325 usque ad annum 350 exortarum. Francof. ad M. 1827. 8.

The opponents of Arianism declared it to be polytheism. On the contrary, the Arians charged the ὁμοούσιος with sabellianism,[1]

Eusebii Caesar. epist. ad Caesarienses, most complete as appended to Athanasii epist. cit. and in Theodoreti h. e. i. 11. The εἷς θεὸς is here the Father alone, consequently the sameness of essence between Him and the Son is not a numerical unity of essence. See Münscher über den Sinn der Nic. Glaubensformel, in Henke's neuem Magazin vi. 334. Even here the sentiment, that the Son exists by the will of the Father, and is less than he, is not spoken against.

[8] See Divis. i. § 60, note 13.

[9] How actively Constantine employed his influence in accomplishing it may be seen in Eusebius vita Const. iii. 13. Since his view had previously been different (see note 5,) and his great object was simply the restoration of peace (Gfrörer's K.G. ii. i. 210), the conjecture is not improbable that *he* had been gained over by Hosius, and *the latter* during his abode at Alexandria; consequently the epithet ὁμοούσιος was of Alexandrian origin, where it had been already set forth in opposition to Dionysius, (Div. i. § 64, note 8,) and had been again rejected expressly by Arius. (See above, note 2).

[1] Socrates i. 24: Οἱ μὲν τοῦ ὁμοουσίου τὴν λέξιν ἐκκλίνοντες τὴν Σαβελλίου καὶ Μοντανοῦ δόξαν εἰσηγεῖσθαι αὐτὴν τοὺς προσδεχομένους ἐνόμιζον, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο βλασφήμους ἐκάλουν, ὡς ἀναιροῦντας τὴν ὑπαρξιν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. οἱ δὲ πάλιν τῷ ὁμοουσίῳ προσκείμενοι, πολυθεΐαν εἰσάγειν τοὺς ἑτέρους νομίζοντες, ὡς Ἑλληνισμὸν εἰσάγοντας ἐξετρέποντο. Augustin. opus imperf. v. 25: Ariani Catholicos Sabellianos vocant. On the other hand, Athanasius expos. fidei (ed. Ben. i. 100): οὔτε γὰρ υἱοπάτορα φρονοῦμεν, ὡς οἱ Σαβέλλιοι, λέγοντες μονοούσιον καὶ οὐχ ὁμοούσιον, καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἀναιροῦντες τὸ εἶναι υἱόν. So far as the Nicenes also explained ὁμοούσιος by ταυτοούσιος, as Theodoret. dial.

and succeeded in spreading this view in the east so generally that Constantine thought he could effect a general union on the disputed dogma only by giving up the expression. Accordingly, the banished were recalled, not only *Eusebius* and *Theognis*, but *Arius* too (328—29), his orthodoxy being acknowledged by the emperor in a confession of faith expressed in general terms which he gave in. Eusebius of Nicomedia obtained a decided influence over Constantine. Several bishops who obstinately adhered to the Nicene decrees, and refused to hold church communion with the recalled, were banished, particularly *Eustathius*, bishop of Antioch (330).[2] Athanasius himself, now bishop of Alexandria, was deposed by a council held at *Tyre* (335), and banished into Gaul by Constantine; and Arius, immediately after, was solemnly received again into church communion at *Jerusalem*. He died not long after at Constantinople (336.)[3] Thus the east was separated from the western church; the latter adopting the ὁμοούσιος, and espousing the cause of Athanasius, which the former rejected. This division continued after the death of Constantine († 337,) when *Constans* had become sovereign of the west, and *Constantius* of the east, and that all the more readily, inasmuch as *Eusebius*, bishop of Nicomedia, gained the same influence over Constantius, as he had formerly over Constantine, and was appointed bishop of Constantinople (338). The prevailing doctrine of the east respecting the Son was the old emanistic doctrine,[4] as had been set forth at the council of

v. in fine (cf. comp. Ancyr. below § 83. not. 5.) they strengthened the suspicion of Sabellianism.

[2] Socrates i. 24. Sozom. ii. 19. Theodoret. i. 21. Athanasius hist. Arian. § 4, cf. Eusebius de vita Const. iii. 59 ss.

[3] On the death of Arius see Walch's Ketzerhist. Th. 2. S. 500—511.

[4] The confession of faith of the first council at Antioch is thus prefaced (ap. Socrat. ii. 10): Ἡμεῖς οὔτε ἀκόλουθοι Ἀρείου γεγόναμεν (πῶς γὰρ ἐπίσκοποι ὄντες ἀκολουθήσομεν πρεσβυτέρῳ;) οὔτε ἄλλην τινὰ πίστιν παρὰ τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐκτεθεῖσαν ἐδεξάμεθα. All the four Antiochian formulae in Athanasius de synodis § 22—25. Cf. Walch bibl. symbol. p. 109 ss. Fuchs Biblioth. d. Kirchenvers. ii. 76. In the formula Antiochena i. we read: εἰς ἕνα υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ μονογενῆ, πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ὑπάρχοντα καὶ συνόντα τῷ γεγεννηκότι αὐτὸν πατρί, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο κ. τ. λ. In the formula Ant. ii.: εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, τὸν μονογενῆ θεόν, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, τὸν γεννηθέντα πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, ὅλον ἐξ ὅλου, μόνον ἐκ μόνου, τέλειον ἐκ τελείου, βασιλέα ἐκ βασιλέως, κύριον ἐκ κυρίου, λόγον ζῶντα, σοφίαν ζῶσαν, φῶς ἀληθινόν, ὁδὸν, ἀλήθειαν, ἀνάστασιν, ποιμένα, θύραν, ἄτρεπτόν τε καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον τῆς θεότητος, οὐσίας τε καὶ βουλῆς, καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπαράλλακτον εἰκόνα· τὸν

Antioch (341), according to which both the Arian formulae and the Nicene ὁμοούσιος were looked upon as objectionable extremes.[5] The Arians, of whom there were certainly many, must have concealed their peculiar sentiments behind emanistic formulae.[6] Thus

πρωτότοκον πάσης τῆς κτίσεως, τὸν ὄντα ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, Θεὸν λόγον, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ· "καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος." δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα συνέστησε· τὸν ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν κατελθόντα ἄνωθεν. εἴ τις παρὰ τὴν ὑγιῆ τῶν γραφῶν ὀρθὴν πίστιν διδάσκει, λέγων, ἢ χρόνον, ἢ καιρὸν, ἢ αἰῶνα ἢ εἶναι, ἢ γεγονέναι πρὸ τοῦ γεννηθῆναι τὸν υἱὸν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. καὶ εἴ τις λέγει τὸν υἱὸν κτίσμα ὡς ἓν τῶν κτισμάτων, ἢ γέννημα ὡς ἓν τῶν γεννημάτων, ἢ ποίημα ὡς ἓν τῶν ποιημάτων—ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. In the formula Ant. iii. (Theophronii Episc. Tyanensis): εἰς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, Θεὸν λόγον, δύναμιν καὶ σοφίαν, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων, Θεὸν τέλειον ἐκ Θεοῦ τελείου, καὶ ὄντα πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἐν ὑποστάσει, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν κατελθόντα. Εἰ δέ τις παρὰ ταύτην τὴν πίστιν διδάσκει, ἢ ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. καὶ Μαρκέλλου τοῦ Ἀγκύρας, ἢ Σαβελλίου, ἢ Παύλου τοῦ Σαμοσατέως, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω καὶ αὐτὸς, καὶ πάντες οἱ κοινωνοῦντες αὐτῷ. In the formula iv. (sent to Constans in Gaul some months after the council): εἰς τὸν μονογενῆ αὐτοῦ υἱόν, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, δι' οὗ ἐγένετο τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὁρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, λόγον ὄντα καὶ σοφίαν, καὶ δύναμιν, καὶ ζωὴν, καὶ φῶς ἀληθινόν. Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων τὸν υἱὸν ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως, καὶ μὴ ἐκ Θεοῦ, καὶ, ἦν ποτε χρόνος ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, ἀλλοτρίους οἶδεν ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. According to Sozomen iii. 5 (where only two Antiochian formulae are mentioned), the second was given out as the Symb. Luciani Martyris (Div. i. § 65, note 6); and from Theodoret it is clear that this is the still so-called formula Antioch II. Athanasius, Hilary, and Socrates, who give the formulae, say nothing of it. The anathema at the end is therefore a later addition.

[5] Comp. Eusebius de fide adv. Sabellium (in Sirmondi Opp. 1. u. Bibl. PP. Ludg. iv.) written according to Philo über die Schriften des Euseb. v. Alex. u. Euseb. v. Emisa. Halle 1832. S. 64, 76, by Eusebius of Emisa, (A.D. 341,) ap. Sirmond. i. 11: Confitere ea, quae de Patre et Filio scripta sunt, et noli curiosius ea, quae non sunt scripta, requirere.—Utinam autem solum legeremus! utinam solis scripturis contenti essemus! et lis nulla fiebat. cf. p. 18, 20, 27. Comp. Cyrillus Hierosolym. in his catacheses held about the year 348, ex Gr. Catech. ad Competentes xv. § 9: νῦν δέ ἐστιν ἡ ἀποστασία. ἀπέστησαν γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστεως· καὶ οἱ μὲν υἱοπατορίαν καταγγέλλουσιν, οἱ δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων εἰς τὸ εἶναι παρενεχθέντα λέγειν τολμῶσι. Καὶ πρότερον μὲν ἦσαν φανεροὶ οἱ αἱρετικοὶ, νῦν δὲ πεπλήρωται ἡ ἐκκλησία κεκρυμμένων αἱρετικῶν. Comp. Touttée on this passage, and his Diss. i. cap. 4. § 17 ss. prefixed to his edition of Cyril.

[6] Respecting the Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ in the Antiochian formulae they said (Socrat. ii. 45): οὕτως εἴρηται τὸ ἐκ Θεοῦ, ὡς εἴρηται παρὰ τῷ Ἀποστόλῳ· τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ (1 Cor. xi. 12): Only the Nicene ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ was not susceptible of an Arian import.

the Orientals were unjustly styled Arians by the Nicenes. More appropriate was the title *Eusebians*,[7] from their head Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia. In order to remove the schism between the east and west, Constantius and Constans united in summoning a new general council at *Sardica* (347).[8] But here the matter went so far as to issue in an entire separation. The westerns remained alone in Sardica; the orientals assembled in the neighbouring town *Philippopolis*. Both parties confirmed their formed acts; and in the east, Eusebianism continued as prevalent under Constantius as the Nicene faith in the west under Constans.

The prejudice of the Eusebians that Homousianism led to Sabellianism,[9] was not a little favoured by the case of *Marcellus*, bishop of Ancyra, one of the principal defenders of the Nicene council. By representing the Logos as the eternal wisdom of God, and contending that the incarnate Logos alone could be called Son of God, this bishop manifestly came near Sabellianism; and when deposed from his office (336), was nevertheless declared orthodox by the westerns, and taken under their protection.[10] A pupil of Marcellus, *Photinus*, bishop of Sirmium,

[7] So Athanasius frequently *οἱ περὶ Εὐσέβιον*.

[8] That it was held in 347, not 344, is proved by Wetzer restit. verae chron. p. 47, against Mansi coll. Conc. iii. 87.

[9] Even Hilarius de Synodis § 67, confesses: multi ex nobis ita unam substantiam Patris et Filii praedicant, ut videri possint non magis id pie quam impie praedicare: habet enim hoc verbum in se et fidei conscientiam, et fraudem paratam.—Unum, in quo par significatur, non ad unicum vendicetur.

[10] Marcellus's chief work was de subjectione domini Christi. (Fragments of it in Marcelliana ed. et animadvers. instruxit Chr. H. G. Rettberg. Goett. 1794, 8). He was answered by Asterius, Eusebius of Caesarea, Acacius, (fragments in Epiphanius haer. 72, § 5—9), Apollinarius and Basil of Ancyra. Of these are extant only Eusebii contra Marcellum libb. ii. and de ecclesiast. theologia libb. 3, (both appended to Eusebii demonstr. evang. Paris 1828. fol.)—His orthodoxy was acknowledged by Julius, bishop of Rome, (epist. ad Episcop. Eusebianos Antiochiae congregatos in Athanasii apol. contra Arianos n. 21—35), Athanasius in several passages, and the Synod of Sardica. On the contrary, the later catholic fathers, Basil the Great, Chrysostom, Sulpicius Severus, and others, judged of him unfavourably. The majority of the moderns, Baronius, Petavius, Schelstrate, &c. hold him also to be a heretic. His most important defender is Montfaucon diatr. de causa Marcelli Ancyrani (in ej. collect. nova Patrum. T. ii. p. 51 ss. Paris 1706, fol.; reprinted in J. Vogt biblioth. hist. haeresiolo-

taught Sabellianism in a fully developed form.[11] His doctrine was rejected not only by the Eusebians at the second *council of Antioch* (345),[12] but also by the westerns at a *council at Milan* (347); and at the first *council of Sirmium* (351),[13] he was deposed by the Eusebians. The party of *the Photinians* continued, however, till the reign of Theodosius the younger. In the meantime, Constans had died (350). Constantius became master of the whole Roman empire, after his victory over *Magnentius* (353), and now endeavoured to introduce Eusebianism by force into the west also. At the synods of *Arelate* (353), and *Mediolanum* (355), the bishops were forced to subscribe the condemnation of Athanasius; all who refused being deposed and

giae t. i. fasc. ii. p. 293 ss. Hamb. 1724. 8). Comp. Walch's Ketzerhist. iii. 229. Klose's Gesch. u. Lehre des Marcellus u. Photinus. Hamburg 1837, 8. Baur's Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit i. 525.

[11] Walch. iii. 3. Klose and Baur l. c.

[12] In the formula Antioch. *μακρόστιχος* (ap. Athanasius de Synodis § 26, and Socrates ii. 19, cf. Walchii bibl. symb. p. 115): *Βδελυσσόμεθα δὲ πρός τούτοις καὶ ἀναθεματίζομεν καὶ τοὺς λόγον μὲν μόνον αὐτὸν ψιλὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνύπαρκτον ἐπιπλάστως καλοῦντας, ἐν ἑτέρῳ τὸ εἶναι ἔχοντα, νῦν μὲν ὡς τὸν προφορικὸν λεγόμενον ὑπό τινων, νῦν δὲ ὡς τὸν ἐνδιάθετον· Χριστὸν δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μεσίτην καὶ εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ μὴ εἶναι πρὸ αἰώνων θέλοντας, ἀλλ' ἔκτοτε Χριστὸν αὐτὸν γεγονέναι καὶ υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐξ οὗ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐκ τῆς παρθένου σάρκα ἀνείληφε, πρὸ τετρακοσίων οὐχ ὅλων ἐτῶν. ἔκτοτε γὰρ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀρχὴν βασιλείας ἐσχηκέναι ἐθέλουσι. καὶ τέλος ἕξειν αὐτὴν μετὰ τὴν συντέλειαν καὶ τὴν κρίσιν. Τοιοῦτοι δέ εἰσιν οἱ ἀπὸ Μαρκέλλου καὶ Φωτεινοῦ* (Athan. *Σκοτεινοῦ*) *τῶν Ἀγκυρογαλατῶν, οἳ τὴν προαιώνιον ὕπαρξιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὴν θεότητα καὶ τὴν ἀτελεύτητον αὐτοῦ βασιλείαν ὁμοίως Ἰουδαίοις ἀθετοῦσιν, ἐπὶ προφάσει τοῦ συνίστασθαι δοκεῖν τῇ μοναρχίᾳ.*

[13] Baronius placed the first Sirmian synod in the year 357. On the other hand, Petavius (in annot. ad Epiphan. p. 300 and diss. de Photino haeretico ejusque damnatione annexed to the third edition of the Rationar. temp. Par. 1636) correctly in the year 351. See his controversy on the subject with Sirmond, who defended Baronius. Petavius has been followed by Matth. Larroquanus (de la Roque) diss. duplex. i. de Photino haeret. ii. de Liberio Pontif. Rom. Genev. 1670. 8. P. de Marca de tempore syn. Sirm. in his dissertatt. ed. Francof. p. 319. Pagi and Tillemont. Mansi, on the contrary, in the treatise before cited (note 8), places the Sirmian Council in the year 358. The confession of faith of the first Sirmian Synod (ap. Athanas. de Syn. § 27) is the formula Antioch iv., to which, however, instead of one, twenty-seven anathemas are appended. Of these, Nos. 4—22 are directed against Photinus. Among other things No. vi. says: *εἴ τις τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ θεοῦ πλατύνεσθαι ἢ συστέλλεσθαι φάσκοι, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.* vii: *εἴ τις πλατυνομένην τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν υἱὸν λέγοι ποιεῖν, ἢ τὸν πλατυσμὸν τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ υἱὸν ὀνομάζοι, ἀν. ἔ.* viii.: *εἴ τις ἐνδιάθετον ἢ προφορικὸν λόγον λέγοι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀ. ἔ.*

banished. Amongst these were *Lucifer*, bishop of Calaris, *Hilary*, bishop of Pictavium, and *Liberius*, bishop of Rome.[14]

§ 83.

DISSENSIONS AMONG THE EUSEBIANS TILL THE SUPPRESSION OF ARIANISM (381).

After the Eusebians had become the predominant party, and those who were internally separated were no longer held together by the necessity of contending together against the Homousiasts, the variety of their opinions, which had been hitherto concealed, began to appear. A strict Arian party came forth among them which was named sometimes after its leaders, *Aetius* of Antioch, (ἄθεος),[1] *Eunomius* of Cappadocia,[2] and *Acacius*, bishop of Caesarea; sometimes from its principles (Ανόμοιοι, Εξουκόντιοι).[3] In opposition to it, the majority, under the leadership of *Basilius*, bishop of Ancyra, and *Georgius*, bishop of Laodicea, held fast by the old emanistic doctrine, adopted the farther development of it which had formerly appeared among the Eusebians, viz. That the Son is of *similar* essence with the Father, (ὁμοιούσιος τῷ πατρί), and were hence called Ὁμοιουσιάσται, Ἡμιάρειοι,

[14] Many others, both those who were banished and those who yielded, are named in Faustini et Marcellini libellus precum ad Impp. in Bibl. pp. Lugd. v. 654.

[1] A συνταγμάτιον by him may be found in Epiphan. haer. lxxvi. 10. Other fragments in A. Maji scriptt. vett. novâ collectio vii. i. 71 s. 202. Respecting him and Eunomius see select homilies of John Chrysostom, translated into German by Ph. Mayer. Nürnberg, 1820. p. 147. Lange in Illgen's Zeitschr. f. d. hist. Theol. v. i. 33. Baur's Dreieinigkeit i. 361.

[2] Concerning him see Basnage in Canisii lectiones antt. vol. i. p. 172 ss. Ullmann's Gregorius v. Nazianz S. 318 ff. Neander's Kirchengesch. ii. 2, 852 ff. Mayer, Lange, and Baur, see not. 1. Klose's Gesch. u. Lehre des Eunomius. Kiel. 1833. 8. His ἔκθεσις τῆς πίστεως prim. ed. H. Valesius in notis ad Socrat. v. 10 ap. Basnage l. c. and in Fabricii bibl. gr. vol. viii. p. 253. Ἀπολογητικὸς e cod. Hamburg. prim. ed. Fabricius l. c. viii. 262 (prologus and epilogus e cod. Tenisoniano also in Cave hist. lit. i. 220). A fragment ἐκ τοῦ περὶ υἱοῦ τρίτου λόγου ap. Majus vii. i. 202.

[3] According to the church-fathers, these Arians rested for support particularly on the Aristotelian philosophy. So also Baur i. 387. Of a contrary opinion is Ritter Gesch. d. christl. Philos. ii. 65, who denies emphatically that Eunomius was an Aristotelian.

Semiariani. The emperor Constantius was attached to the Semiarians; but a powerful party about his court exerted themselves with no less cunning than perseverance in favour of the Anomoeans. And because they could not publicly vindicate their formula, they persuaded the emperor, that in order to restore peace, the formulas of the two other parties also must be prohibited; which measure they brought about at *the second synod of Sirmium* (357).[4] On the other hand, *Basil*, bishop of Ancyra, called together *a synod at Ancyra* (358), which established the Semiarian creed in a copious decree, and rejected the Arian.[5] Constantius allowed himself to be easily convinced

[4] Formula Sirmiensis ii. (in the Latin original ap. Hilarius de Synodis § 11, translated into Greek, Athanas. de Synod. § 28. Walch bibl. symb. p. 133, comp. Fuchs ii. 196): Unum constat Deum esse omnipotentem et patrem, sicut per universum orbem creditur, et unicum filium ejus Jesum Christum, dominum salvatorem nostrum, ex ipso ante saecula genitum. Quod vero quosdam aut multos movebat de substantia, quae graece usia adpellatur, id est, ut expressius intelligatur, homousion, aut quod dicitur homoeusion, nullam omnino fieri oportere mentionem, nec quemquam praedicare: ea de causa et ratione, quod nec in divinis scripturis contineatur, et quod super hominis scientiam sit, nec quisquam possit nativitatem filii enarrare, de quo scriptum est: generationem ejus quis enarrabit? Scire autem manifestum est solum patrem, quomodo genuerit filium suum, et filium, quomodo genitus sit a patre. Nulla ambiguitas est, majorem esse patrem. Nulli potest dubium esse, patrem honore, dignitate, claritate, majestate et ipso nomine patris majorem esse filio, ipso testante: qui me misit, major me est. Et hoc catholicum esse, nemo ignorat, duas personas esse patris et filii, majorem patrem: filium subjectum cum omnibus his, quae ipsi pater subjecit. Patrem initium non habere, invisibilem esse, immortalem esse, impassibilem esse. Filium autem natum esse ex patre, deum ex deo, lumen ex lumine. Cujus filii generationem, ut ante dictum est, neminem scire, nisi patrem suum, caet.

[5] The decrees of this Synod ap. Epiphan. haer. 73, § 2—11. Comp. Fuchs ii. 213. § 9: *ὡς ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας, οὐκ ἐπὶ τὴν ταυτότητα ἤγετο τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς οὐσίας ὁμοιότητα· οὕτως οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς, ὅμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν γενόμενος τῷ γεννήσαντι πατρὶ, εἰς ταυτότητα ἄξει τοῦ πατρὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ οὐσίαν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν ὁμοιότητα.* § 10: *Καὶ εἴ τις—μὴ—τὴν ὁμοιότητα καὶ κατ' οὐσίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ πρὸς πατέρα ὁμολογοίη, ὡς ψευδωνύμως λέγων τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν, καὶ μήτε πατέρα λέγων ἀληθῶς μήτε υἱὸν, ἀλλὰ κτιστὴν καὶ κτίσμα—ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.* § 11: *Καὶ εἴ τις τὸ ἔκτισέ με, καὶ τὸ γεννᾷ με παρ' αὐτοῦ ἀκούων, τὸ γεννᾷ με μὴ ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ κατ' οὐσίαν ἐννοεῖ, ἀλλὰ ταὐτὸν λέγοι τὸ γεννᾷ με τῷ ἔκτισέ με, ὡς μὴ λέγων τὸν υἱὸν τὸν ἐ;παθῶς τέλειον ἐκ τῶν δύο ὀνομάτων, τοῦ ἔκτισέ με καὶ τοῦ γεννᾷ με, κτίσμα μόνον ὁμολογῶν καὶ μηκέτι υἱὸν, ὡς παραδέδωκεν ἡ σοφία ἐκ τῶν δύο εὐσεβῶς τὴν ἔννοιαν, ἃ. ἴ. Καὶ εἴ τις τοῦ υἱοῦ τὴν μὲν κατ' οὐσίαν πρὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πατέρα ὁμοιότητα ἡμῖν ἀποκαλύπτοντος, δι' ὧν φησι· ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ζωὴν ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ, οὕτως*

that that Sirmian formula favoured the Anomoeans; and therefore the confession of faith adopted at the second must now be rejected at a *third synod of Sirmium* (358), and the Anathemas of the synod of Ancyra be subscribed.[6] The Anomoeans, for the purpose of uniting in appearance with the Semiarians, and yet establishing their own doctrine, now adopted the formula, τὸν υἱὸν ὅμοιον τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ πάντα, ὡς αἱ ἅγιαι γραφαὶ λέγουσί τε καὶ διδάσκουσι,[7] and succeeded in convincing the emperor that all parties might be most easily united in it. For this purpose all bishops were now prepared, and then the westerns were summoned to a council at *Ariminum*, the easterns to another at *Seleucia*, simultaneously (359). After many efforts, the emperor at last succeeded in getting most of the bishops to adopt that formula. But along with this external union, not only did the internal doctrinal schism continue, bnt there were besides differences among such as had been like-minded, whether they had gone in with that union or not. Thus Constantius at his death left all in the greatest confusion.[8]

καὶ τῷ υἱῷ ἔδωκε ζωὴν ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ (John v. 26)· τὴν δὲ κατ' ἐνέργειαν, δι' ὧν παιδεύει· ἃ γὰρ ἂν ὁ πατὴρ ποιῇ, ταῦτα καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁμοίως ποιεῖ (Joh. v. 19), μόνην τὴν κατ' ἐνέργειαν ὁμοιότητα διδοὺς, τῆς κατ' οὐσίαν, ἥ ἐστι τὸ κεφαλαιωδέστατον ἡμῶν τῆς πίστεως, ἀποστεροίη τὸν υἱὸν—ἀ. ἔ. (so according to a correction). Εἴ τις—ἀνόμοιον λέγοι κατ' οὐσίαν τὸν υἱὸν τῷ πατρὶ, ἀ. ἔ. Εἴ τις τὸν πατέρα πρεσβύτερον χρόνῳ λέγοι τοῦ ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ, νεώτερον δὲ χρόνῳ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ πατρὸς, ἀ. ἔ. But also finally: Εἴ τις ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ οὐσίᾳ λέγων τὸν πατέρα πατέρα τοῦ υἱοῦ, ὁμοούσιον δὲ ἢ ταυτοούσιον λέγοι τὸν υἱὸν τῷ πατρὶ, ἀ. ἔ.

[6] Concerning Liberius, bishop of Rome, who in the year 358 subscribed two Eusebian formulas in succession, for the purpose of regaining his episcopal dignity, see Larroquani, § 82, diss. cited, note 13, and Jo. la Placette observationes hist. eccles., quibus eruitur veteris ecclesiae sensus circa Pont. Rom. potestatem in definiendis fidei rebus. Amstel. 1695. p. 137—150.

[7] The same is found in the formula Sirmiensis tertia, which was composed by some Arians at Sirmium, and was submitted at Ariminum (in Athanasii de Synodis Arimini et Seleuciae celebratis epist. c. 8), in the formula Nices condita, which was received at the end at Ariminum (in Theodoreti hist. eccl. ii. 21) in the formula Seleuciensis (ap. Athanas. de Syn. c. 29) and the Constantinopolitana (ap. Athanas. l. c. c. 30), all belonging to the year 359. Comp. Fuchs ii. 201, 259, 271, 273.

[8] There is a correct estimate of his character in Ammian. Marcellin. xxi. 16: Christianam religionem absolutam et simplicem anili superstitione confudens; in qua scrutanda perplexius, quam componenda gravius, excitavit discidia plurima, quae progressa fusius aluit concertatione verborum: ut catervis Antistitum jumentis publicis ultro citroque discur-

The interference of emperors, which was foreign to the object of religion, now ceased, at least for some time. *Julian* (361—363) was of course equally indifferent to all Christian sects, and restored all banished bishops to their sees.[9] *Jovian* also († 364) and his successors in the west, *Valentinian I.* († 375), then *Gratian* and *Valentinian II.* maintained general toleration. On the contrary, *Valens*, emperor of the east, (364—378), was a zealous Arian, and persecuted the Homousiasts and Semiarians.

Since the last years of Constantius, various causes had been always tending to increase in the east the number of adherents to the Nicene council. When, in its greatest strictness, Arianism wished to regain the ascendancy, the majority of the orientals, who held fast by the emanation of the Son from the Father, must have felt a most decided aversion to it; while the Nicene decrees were naturally allied to those older notions, as fuller developments of them. Besides, the unity of the Nicenes, as contrasted with the constant wavering of the Eusebians, could do nothing less than make a most favourable impression. To this was added finally, the influence of monachism, which, having now arisen in Egypt, and speedily excited universal admiration, was closely connected with Athanasius; and in all countries where it was diffused, was busy in favour of the Nicene council.[10]

rentibus per Synodos, quas appellant, dum ritum omnem ad suum trahere conatur arbitrium, rei vehiculariae succideret nervos. .

[9] Ammian. Marc. xxii. 5: Utque dispositorum roboraret effectum, dissidentes Christianorum Antistites cum plebe discissa in palatium intromissos monebat civilius, ut discordiis consopitis quisque nullo vetante religioni suae serviret intrepidus. Quod agebat ideo obstinate, ut dissensiones augente licentia, non timeret unanimantem postea plebem; nullas infestas hominibus bestias, ut sunt sibi ferales plerique Christianorum, expertus. Saepeque dictitabat: Audite me quem Alemanni audierunt et Franci.

[10] Hence the frequent persecutions of the monks in Egypt by the Arians. Cf. Athanasii encyclica c. 3, hist. Arianorum c. 70, 72, and often. In like manner under Valens, Socrat. iv. 22 and 24. Thus the monks of Cappadocia, in the year 363, broke off church communion with Gregory, bishop of Nazianzum, father of the theologian, because he had subscribed an ambiguous formula. See Ullmann's Gregor. v. Nazianz. S. 61. Gregory of Nazianzum, orat. xxi. p. 388, says of the monks in reference to that occurrence: οἱ κἂν τἆλλα ὦσιν εἰρηνικοί τε καὶ μέτριοι, τοῦτό γε οὐ φέρουσιν ἐπιεικεῖς εἶναι, θεὸν προδιδόναι διὰ τῆς ἡσυχίας. ἀλλὰ καὶ λίαν εἰσὶν ἐνταῦθα πολεμικοί τε καὶ δύσμαχοι—καὶ θᾶττον ἄν τι μὴ δέοι συμπεριήσαιεν, ἢ δέοι παραλίποιεν.

First of all, *Meletius* declared himself in favour of the Nicene confession, immediately after he had been nominated bishop of Antioch, A.D. 361.[11] But the old Nicene community which had still existed in Antioch from the time of Eustathius (§ 82, note 2), and was now headed by a presbyter *Paulinus*, refused to acknowledge the former Eusebian as bishop; and this *Meletian* schism[12] soon found a ground for itself also in the doctrinal distinction that the Meletians believed they must abide by three *Hypostases* in the Trinity, while the old Nicenes would only acknowledge in it three *Prosopa*.[13] *The council of Alexandria,*

[11] Epiphan. haer. lxxiii. c. 28, 34. Socrât. ii. 44. Sozom. iv. 26. Theodoret. ii. 27. Soon after (363) many other Semiarian bishops joined him in a Synod at Antioch (Socrat. iii. 25).

[12] Respecting this schism, see Walch's Ketzerhistorie Th. 4. S. 410 ff.

[13] The Nicene Synod considered *οὐσία* and *ὑποστασις* as synonymous when it anathematised the formula, *ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας εἶναι.* The old Nicenes, the Egyptians, and Westerns, held fast by this. So Athanasius ep. ad Afros c. 4: *ἡ ὑπόστασις οὐσία ἐστί, καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο σημαινόμενον ἔχει, ἢ αὐτὸ τὸ ὄν· ἡ γὰρ ὑπόστασις καὶ ἡ οὐσία ὕπαρξίς ἐστιν. ἔστι γὰρ καὶ ὑπάρχει.* Gregory of Nazianzum (orat. xxi.) derives this interchange of the terms from the poverty of the Latin language, which certainly translated both by substantia. We might venture to suppose here that the Nicene creed originated especially under the influence of a Latin, Hosius (see § 81, note 9). Hence the expression *τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις*, as well as *τρεῖς οὐσίαι*, in Rome and Alexandria was regarded as Arian, and Meletius and Eusebius, bishops of Samosata, were here accustomed *τοῖς Ἀρειομανίταις συγκατηρῖθμῆσθαι* (Basil. ep. 266). Basil may be considered the representative of the opposite view. Ep. 236: *οὐσία καὶ ὑπόστασις ταύτην ἔχει τὴν διαφοράν, ἣν ἔχει τὸ κοινὸν πρὸς τὸ καθ' ἕκαστον.* (Comp. similar explanations by others in Maji scriptt. vett. nova coll. vii. 1, 11.) He declares it therefore to be a matter of the highest importance to acknowledge *τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις*, since even Sabellius taught *μίαν ὑπόστασιν* and *τρία πρόσωπα*. Comp. especially Basilii ep. 38: also ep. 125, 210, 214. (Klose's Basil. d. Gr. S. 28.) Consequently he is delighted with his explanation *τὸ τρεῖς ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι τὰς ὑποστάσεις ὁμολογεῖν*, epist. 258 ad Epiphanium. In Epist. 263 ad Occidentales, he accuses Paulinus of a leaning *πρὸς τὸ Μαρκέλλου δόγμα, οὔτε υἱὸν ἐν ἰδίᾳ ὑποστάσει ὁμολογοῦν, ἀλλὰ προενεχθέντα, καὶ πάλιν ὑποστρέψαντα εἰς τὸν ὅθεν προῆλθεν.* The Orientals generally had entertained the same suspicion against the Latins. See Basilii ep. 69 ad Athanasium, A.D. 371: *Ἐπιζητεῖται δὲ κἀκεῖνο παρὰ τινῶν τῶν ἐντεῦθεν ἀναγκαίως, ὡς καὶ αὐτοῖς ἡμῖν καταφαίνεται, τὸ τὴν Μαρκέλλου αἵρεσιν αὐτοὺς* (Occidentales)—*ἐξορίσαι. ἐπεὶ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν ἐν πᾶσιν οἷς ἐπιστέλλουσι γράμμασι τὸν μὲν δυσώνυμοι Ἄρειον ἄνω καὶ κάτω ἀναθεματίζοντες—οὐ διαλείπουσι. Μαρκέλλῳ δὲ, τῷ κατὰ διάμετρον ἐκείνῳ τὴν ἀσέβειαν ἐτιδειξαμένῳ, καὶ εἰς αὐτὴν τὴν ὕπαρξιν τῆς τοῦ μονογενοῦς θεότητος ἀσεβήσαντι—οὐδεμίαι μέμψει ἐπενεγκόντες φαίνον-*

assembled by Athanasius (362), sought indeed not only to smooth the way generally for the Arians to join their party by mild measures, but endeavoured particularly to settle this dispute;[14] but *Lucifer*, bishop of Calaris, gave firm footing to the Meletian schism about the same time, by consecrating as bishop *Paulinus* the Eustathian. Although *Lucifer*, from dissatisfaction with the mildness of the Alexandrian synod, separated with his followers from the church,[15] he had nevertheless put a great obstacle in the way of uniting the old and new Nicenes by the step taken in consecrating Paulinus. The westerns and Egyptians acknowledged *Paulinus;* the oriental Nicenes, *Meletius*, as the orthodox bishop of Antioch. If the emperor *Valens* (364—378), had now favoured the Semiarians instead of the Arians, he might perhaps have considerably checked the further spread of the Nicene party; but since he wished to make Arianism alone predominant by horribly persecuting all who thought differently,[16]

ται. A milder judgment is given by Gregor. Naz. or. xxi.: τῆς μιᾶς οὐσίας καὶ τῶν τριῶν ὑποστάσεων λεγομένων μὲν ὑφ' ἡμῶν εὐσεβῶς, νοουμένων δὲ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς Ἰταλοῖς ὁμοίως, ἀλλ' οὐ δυναμένης διὰ στενότητα τῆς παρ' αὐτοῖς γλώττης καὶ ὀνομάτων πενίαν διελεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς οὐσίας τὴν ὑπόστασιν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀντεισαγούσης τὰ πρόσωπα, ἵνα μὴ τρεῖς οὐσίαι παραδεχθῶσι· τί γίνεται ὡς λίαν γελοῖον ἢ ἐλεεινόν; πίστεως ἔδοξε διαφορὰ ἡ περὶ τὸν ἦχον σμικρολογία.

[14] Epistola synodica Conc. Alex. (ap. Mansi iii. p. 345 ss.): Πάντας τοίνυν τοὺς βουλομένους εἰρηνεύειν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, μάλιστα τοὺς ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ συναγομένους (the Meletians) καὶ τοὺς ἀπό τῶν Ἀρειανῶν, προσκαλέσασθε παρ' ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ὡς μὲν πατέρες υἱοὺς προσλάβεσθε, ὡς δὲ διδάσκαλοι καὶ κηδεμόνες ἀποδείξασθε, καὶ συνάψαντες ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς ἀγαπητοῖς ἡμῶν τοῖς περὶ Παυλῖνον, μηδὲν πλεῖον ἀπαιτήσητε παρ' αὐτῶν, ἢ ἀναθεματίζειν μὲν τὴν Ἀρειάνην αἵρεσιν, ὁμολογεῖν δὲ τὴν παρ' αὐτῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ὁμολογηθεῖσαν ἐν Νικαίᾳ πίστιν. Then an explanation of the dispute respecting the hypostases. The one party teaches that there are three hypostases διὰ τὸ εἰς ἁγίαν τριάδα πιστεύειν οὐκ ὀνόματι τριάδα μόνον, ἀλλ' ἀληθῶς οὖσαν καὶ ὑφεστῶσαν, πατέρα τε ἀληθῶς ὄντα καὶ ὑφεστῶτα, καὶ υἱὸν ἀληθῶς ἐνούσιον ὄντα καὶ ὑφεστῶτα, καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ὑφεστὸς καὶ ὑπάρχον. The others, on the contrary, taught that there was one hypostasis, ἡγούμενοι ταὐτὸν εἶναι εἰπεῖν ὑπόστασιν καὶ οὐσίαν. Those who were present of both parties might have mutually acknowledged one another as orthodox and agreed, βελτίονα καὶ ἀκριβεστέραν εἶναι τὴν ἐν Νικαίᾳ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ὁμολογηθεῖσαν πίστιν, καὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ τοις ταύτης ἀρκεισθαι μᾶλλον καὶ χρῆσθαι ῥήμασιν.

[15] On the Luciferian schism see Walch's Ketzerhist. Th. 3. S. 338 ff. E. A. Frommanni de Lucifero Calaritano olim praesule epistola. Coburgi 1767. 4.

[16] The λόγος προσφωνητικός, by which Themistius about 372 in Antioch

he drove by this means the Semiarians who did not sink under persecution, to unite still more closely with the Nicenes. Thus a great part of the Semiarians, (or as they were now also called *Macedonians*, from Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, who had been deposed at the instigation of the Arians, 360),[17] declared themselves, at several councils of Asia Minor, in favour of the Nicene confession, and sent an embassy to Rome to announce their assent to it (366).[18] However much the Arians, supported by the emperor Valens, endeavoured to counteract this new turn of affairs, yet the Macedonians were always passing over more and more to the Nicene creed; and for this the three great teachers of the church in particular; *Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzum, and Gregory of Nyssa*, began now to work. These new oriental Nicenians did not believe their faith changed by their assent to the Nicene formula, but thought they had merely assumed a more definite expression for it in the rightly understood ὁμοούσιος.[19] They abided by the three hypostases of their

is said to have disposed the emperor to milder measures, Socrat. iv. 32. Sozom. vi. 36. is lost, and must not be confounded with the orat. de religionibus (§ 77. not. 5.), Neander ii. 1, 149. A.

[17] Socrat. ii. 45.

[18] Socrat. iv. 12: φόβῳ μᾶλλον καὶ βίᾳ στενοχωρούμενοι, κατὰ πόλεις διεπρεσβεύοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους, δηλοῦντες δεῖν ἐξ ἀνάγκης καταφεύγειν περί τε τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ βασιλέως (Valentinianum i.), καὶ ἐπὶ Λιβέριον τῆς Ῥώμης Ἐπίσκοπον, ἀσπάζεσθαί τε τῶν ἐκείνων πίστιν μᾶλλον ἢ κοινωνεῖν τοῖς περὶ Εὐδόξιον. cf. Sozom. vi. 10.

[19] Syn. Antioch. ann. 363. epist. ad Jovianum (ap. Socr. iii. 25): τὸ δοκοῦν ξένον τισὶν ὄνομα, τὸ τοῦ ὁμοουσίου signifies, ὅτι ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός ὁ υἱὸς ἐγεννήθη, καὶ ὅτι ὅμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν τῷ πατρί. Those sent by Macedonius to Liberius (Sozom. vi. 10) τὸ ὁμοούσιον ὄνομα δέχονται, ὡς τῷ ὁμοίῳ κατ' οὐσίαν τὰ αὐτά σημαῖνον. In like manner Basilius ep. ix. ad Maximum: ἐγὼ δὲ—τὸ ὅμοιον κατ' οὐσίαν—δέχομαι τὴν φωνήν, ὡς εἰς ταὐτὸν τῷ ὁμοουσίῳ φέρουσαν, κατὰ τὴν ὑγιῆ δηλονότι τοῦ ὁμοουσίου διάνοιαν. Basil had belonged to the Semiarians (Klose's Basilius d. G. Stralsund 1835. S. 21), and among the heads of them, such as Basil of Ancyra and Eustathius of Sebaste, had been active at the theological disputations in Constantinople 359. (Gregor. Nyss. contra Eunom. i. p. 301. Philostorg. iv. c. 12.): He writes, however, of himself, epist. 223. § 3: ἐν γε τοῦτο τολμῶ καυχᾶσθαι ἐν κυρίῳ, ὅτι οὐδέ ποτε πεπλανημένας ἔσχον τὰς περὶ θεοῦ ὑπολήψεις, ἢ ἑτέρως φρονῶν μετέμαθον ὕστερον.—ὥσπερ γὰρ τὸ σπέρμα αὐξανόμενον μεῖζον μὲν ἀπὸ μικροῦ γίνεται, ταὐτὸν δέ ἐστιν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, οὐ κατὰ γένος μεταβαλλόμενον, ἀλλὰ κατ' αὔξησιν τελειούμενον· οὕτω λογίζομαι καὶ ἐμοὶ τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον διὰ τῆς προκοπῆς ηὐξῆσθαι, οὐχὶ δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὄντος τὸν νῦν ὑπάρχοντα γεγενῆσθαι. In this sense Athanasius, de synodis § 41. passes judgment also on the Semiarians: πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἀποδεχομένους τὰ μὲν ἄλλα πάντα τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ γραφέντων, περὶ δὲ μόνου τοῦ ὁμοουσίου ἀμφιβάλ-

Semiarianism, and attached themselves to the Meletians; but on this very account they could not keep church communion with the old Nicenes, notwithstanding all the efforts made by Basil to effect that object.[20] Since they supposed that they had unchangeably remained stedfast to their faith, they also continued to consider their Eusebian and Semiarian forefathers as orthodox, although condemned by the old Nicenes.[21] Thus the canons of the oriental councils held during the schism, constantly remained in force, particularly those of *the council of Antioch*, A.D. 341,[22]

λοντας, χρὴ μὴ ὡς πρὸς ἐχθροὺς διακεῖσθαι· καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἡμεῖς οὐχ ὡς πρὸς Ἀρειομανίτας, οὐδ' ὡς μαχομένους πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἐνιστάμεθα, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀδελφοὶ πρὸς ἀδελφοὺς διαλεγόμεθα, τὴν αὐτὴν μὲν ἡμῖν διάνοιαν ἐχοντας, περὶ δὲ τὸ ὄνομα μόνον διστάζοντας. In like manner Hilarius de synodis § 76 ss.

[20] Comp. Basilii ep. 69. ad Athanasium, ep. 70 ad Damasum both A.D. 371 (see Garnier vita Basilii p. 94. prefixed to Tom. iii. Opp. Bas.). Then A.D. 372 ep. ad Occidentales, ep. 91. ad Valerianum Illyric. Episc., ep. 92. ad Italos et Gallos (Garnier p. 110).—A.D. 376: ep. 242. Orientalium ad Occidentales, ep. 243. Basilii ad Episc. Italos et Gallos (Garnier p. 159).—A.D. 377: ep. 263. Orientalium ad Occidentales (Garnier p. 165). Concerning these negotiations with the Δυτικοῖς Basil affirms, ep. 239. ad Euseb. Episc. Samosatorum A.D. 376: ἐμοὶ μὲν γὰρ τὸ τοῦ Διομήδους (Iliad ix. 698. 699.) ἐπεργχεται λέγειν· μὴ ὄφελες λίσσεσθαι· διότι, φησίν, ἀγήνωρ ἐστὶν ὁ ἀνήρ. Τῷ ὄντι γὰρ θεραπευόμενα τὰ ὑπερήφανα ἤδη ἑαυτῶν ὑπεροπτικώτερα γίνεσθαι πέφυκε. Καὶ γὰρ ἐὰν μὲν ἱλασθῇ ἡμῖν ὁ κύριος, ποίας ἑτέρας προσδήκης δεόμεθα; ἐὰν δὲ ἐπιμείνῃ ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ, ποία βοήθεια ἡμῖν τῆς δυτικῆς ὀρρύος; οἳ τὸ ἀληθὲς οὔτε ἴσασιν οὔτε μαθεῖν ἀνεχονται, ψευδέσι δὲ ὑπονοίαις προειλημμένοι, ἐκεῖνα τοιοῦσι νῦν, ἃ πρότερον ἐπὶ Μαρκελλῳ. πρὸς μὲν τοὺς τὴν ἀλήθειαν αὐτοῖς ἀπαγγέλλοντας φιλονεικήσαντες. τὴν δὲ αἵρεσιν δι' ἑαυτῶν βεβαιώσαντες. Ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸς, ἄνευ τοῦ κοινοῦ σχήματος, ἐβουλόμην αὐτῶν ἐπισχεῖλαι τῷ κορυφαίῳ, περὶ μὲν τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν οὐδὲν, εἰ μὴ ὅσον παραινίξασθαι, ὅτι οὔτε ἴσασι τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, οὔτε τὴν ὁδὸν, δι' ἧς ἂν μανθάνοιεν, καταδέχονται. J. E. Feisser diss. de vita Basilii M. Groning. 1828. 8. p. 96 ss. Klose's Basilius d. G. S. 183. 201. 238.

[21] The Bishop Dianius, one of the predecessors of Basil in Caesarea, had played a principal part among the Eusebian bishops at the councils of Antioch and Philippopolis; yet Basil praises him very much notwithstanding, ep. 51, and assures us ep. 140: ἔστι τοίνυν ἐκ πατέρων ἐμπολιτευομένη τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἡμῶν ἡ γραφεῖσα παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων πίστις τῶν κατὰ τὴν Νίκαιαν συνελθόντων. In like manner Gregor. Naz. orat. iii. Sozom. v. 10. Theodoret. h. e. iii. 3. praise the Semiarian Marcus bishop of Arethusa as a Christian martyr under Julian.

[22] Innocentius i. ep. 7. ad Constantinopolitanos A.D. 405, designates these 25 canons as composed by heretics,—non solum non sequendos, verum etiam una cum haereticis et schismaticis dogmatibus condemnandos: yet the orientals held them fast. The council of Chalcedon appeals to them Act. 4. Soon after they were translated in the prisca versio with the Greek Codex Canonum, were transferred for the greater part

and of *Laodicea*, (perhaps A.D. 363),[23] which canons afterwards passed over from the oriental to the occidental church.

During this time new schisms had been made by new disputes on points of doctrine. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit, amid the controversies respecting the Logos, had for a long time remained untouched, and very different views respecting it were in consequence entertained.[24] But when in the east not only the Semiarians, but also many of the new Nicenians could not get rid of the Arian idea that the Holy Spirit is a creature and servant of God,[25] the other Nicenes took great offence at this, and opposed these errorists as Πνευματομάχους.[26] But they were

into the Canones Apostolorum (see Divis. I. § 67. not. 5.), and enjoyed from this time forward, even in the west, undisputed authority. Pope Zacharias ep. 7. ad Pipinum calls them beatorum patrum sanctiones, Nicolaus i. ep. 9. ad Michaelem Imp. venerabiles Antiochenos et sacros canones. On this account modern Catholic historians have wished to make two Antiochian councils, a Catholic and a Eusebian one. Eman. a Schelstrate sacr. Antiochenum concil. pro Arianorum conciliabulo passim habitum, nunc vero primum ex antiquitate auctoritati suae restitutum. Antverp. 1681. 4. P. et H. fratres Ballerinii de antiquis collectionibus canonum P. I. c. 4. § 2. (in the appendix to the Opp. Leonis M. Venet. 1757. Reprinted in A. Gallandii de vetustis canonum collectionibus dissertationum sylloge. Venet. 1778. fol. Mogunt. 1790. Tomi ii. 4.)

[23] Because Gratian Decreti P. I. Dist. 16. c. 11. says of the Laodicean canons: quorum auctor maxime Theodosius Episcopus extitit, Gothofredus ad Philost. and Pagi crit. ann. 314. no. 25 conjecture that the Eunomian Theodosius, bishop of Philadelphia in Lydia, brought about this synod. cf. Philostorg. viii. c. 4.

[24] Gregorii Naz. orat. theol. v. de Spir. S. § 5. (Orat. 31, formerly 37): Τῶν δὲ καθ' ἡμᾶς σοφῶν οἱ μὲν ἐνέργειαν τοῦτο (τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον) ὑπέλαβον, οἱ δὲ κτίσμα, οἱ δὲ Θεὸν, οἱ δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ὁπότερον τούτων, αἰσοῖ τῆς γραφῆς, ὡς φασιν, ὡς οὐδὲν ἕτερον σαφῶς δηλωσάσης.—οἱ μὲν ἄχρι διανοίας εἰσὶν εὐσεβεῖς, οἱ δὲ τολμῶσιν εὐσεβεῖν καὶ τοῖς χείλεσιν κ. τ. λ. Hilarius de trin. ii. 29: Cum dicunt, per quem sit (Sp. S.), et ob quid sit, vel qualis sit; si responsio nostra displicebit dicentium: "per quem omnia, et ex quo omnia sunt, et quia Spiritus est Dei, donum fidelium;" displiceant et Apostoli et Prophetae, hoc tantum de eo quod esset loquentes. On the following dispute see Baur's Dreieinigkeit i. 490.

[25] Fragm. arianum xiv. in Maji scriptt. vett. nova coll. iii. ii. 229: Spir. S. est primum et majus Patris per Filium opus, creatum per Filium. Maximinus, Ep. Arianus (about 382), in G. Waitz über d. Leben u. die Lehre des Ulfila. Hannover 1840. 4. S. 19: Spiritum Sanctum,—a Patre per Filium ante omnia factum,—ab ingenito per unigenitum in tertio gradu creatum, is proved by Joh. i. 3: Omnia per ipsum facta sunt, und 1 Cor. viii. 6: Unus Deus Pater, ex quo omnia, et unus dominus J. Chr., per quem omnia.

[26] They were first attacked by Athanasius epist. iv. ad Serapionem

not yet all prepared to style the Holy Spirit God.[27] Finally, the number of sects was increased by a zealous adherent of

Episc. Thmuitanum (between 358 and 360), after Serapion had informed him (epist. l. init.) ὡς ἐξελθόντων μέν τινων ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀρειανῶν διὰ τὴν κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ βλασφημίαν, φρονούντων δὲ κατὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος καὶ λεγόντων αὐτὸ μὴ μόνον κτίσμα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν λειτουργικῶν πνευμάτων ἓν αὐτὸ εἶναι, καὶ βαθμῷ μόνον αὐτὸ διαφέρειν τῶν ἀγγέλων. Epist. synod. Conc. Alex. i. T. 362.—Basilii M. de Spiritu S. lib. ad Amphilochium i. T. 374.—Gregorii Nazianz. orat. 37 u. 44. (Comp. Ullmann's Gregorius v. Naz. S. 378 ff.) Epiphanius adv. haer. (about 374) haer. lxxiii. τῶν Ἡμιαρείων. § 1: οἱ δὲ αὐτοὶ καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἴσως τοῖς Πνευματομάχοις εἰσὶν ἔχοντες. Haer. lxxiv. τῶν Πνευματομάχων. § 1. Ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν Ἡμιαρείων, καὶ ἀπὸ ὀρθοδόξων τινὲς, ὡς εἰπεῖν, τέρας τισὶ [leg. τεράστιοι] γεννηθέντες ἄνθρωποι—βλασφημοῦσι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. Philastrius [about 380] de haeresibus c. 67: Semiariani sunt quoque. Hi de Patre et Filio bene sentiunt,—Spiritum autem non de divina substantia, nec Deum verum, sed factum atque creatum Spiritum praedicantes, ut eum conjungant et comparent creaturae. In all these writers Pneumatomachi is still the exclusive appellation of these errorists. On the contrary, the Semiarians were at that time called Macedonians. At the time of the first council of Constantinople (381), Constantinople was the chief seat of the Semiarians (cf. Gregorii Naz. vita a Gregor. Presb. conscripta. Socrat. ii. 45: οἱ περὶ Μακεδόνιον εἰς τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον πλεονάζουσι). Hence the appellations Semiariani, Pneumatomachi und Macedoniani (can. 1 u. 7) were used as synonymous by this council. Inasmuch as the peculiarity of this party regarding the doctrine of the Son was unimportant, nothing but their views of the Holy Spirit remained to make them heretical. Hence, by an easy transition, Macedonius came to be considered the author of this heresy, as is the case so early as Sozom. iv. 27: ἐπειδὴ Μακεδόνιος ἀφηρέθη τὴν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐκκλησίαν, εἰσηγεῖτο τὸν υἱὸν Θεὸν εἶναι, κατὰ πάντα τε καὶ κατ' οὐσίαν ὅμοιον τῷ πατρί· τὸ δὲ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἄμοιρον τῶν αὐτῶν πρεσβείων ἀπεφαίνετο, διάκονον καὶ ὑπηρέτην καλῶν, καὶ ὅσα περὶ τῶν Θείων ἀγγέλων λέγων τις οὐκ ἂν ἁμάρτοι. Hence, from this time onward the usual name for those who were heretical in their views of the Holy Ghost was Macedoniani, instead of Pneumatomachi; although it is unquestionable that Macedonius, though he entertained those sentiments, like all the Semiarians, was not the author of them.

[27] Eustathius bishop of Sebaste, who had been at the head of that Semiarian embassy to Rome (see note 18), and had since become a Nicenian, declared: ἐγὼ οὔτε Θεὸν ὀνομάζειν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον αἱροῦμαι, οὔτε κτίσμα καλεῖν τολμήσαιμι (Socrat. ii. 25). It is true that subsequently the orientals accused him before the occidentals of having gone over to the Arians, and having become πρωτοστάτης τῆς τῶν πνευματομάχων αἱρέσεως (Basilii ep. 263. § 3.). In conformity with that earlier declaration of Eustathius was the conduct also of his friend at that time, Basil the Great. He would have all admitted to church fellowship ep. 113. τοὺς μὴ λέγοντας κτίσμα τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. But he himself abstained from calling the Holy Ghost God, on which Gregory of Nazianzum was obliged to hear reproaches (Gregor. ep. 26. ad Basil.), and exculpated

the Nicene council, *Apollinaris*, bishop of Laodicea, who, misled perhaps by his aversion to Origen,[28] believed that he was necessarily obliged to admit so much in the Arian creed,[29] that the Logos in Christ supplied the place of the rational soul νοῦς or ψυχὴ λογική,[30] and from about 371 gathered round him the advocates of this opinion (Apollinaristae, Συνουσιασταί, Δυμοιριταί.)[31]

Basil in this way: πολὺς περὶ αὐτὸν ὁ πόλεμος, ζητούντων λαβέσθαι τῶν αἱρετικῶν γυμνῆς τῆς φωνῆς (namely περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος, ὡς εἴη θεὸς),—ἵν' ὁ μὲν ἐξωσθῇ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ῥιζωθῇ δὲ τὸ κακὸν ἐν τῇ πόλει. So also in his laudatory address to Basil orat. xx. p. 364. The monks in Caesarea were particularly indignant against Basil, but in opposition to them he was justified by Athanasius ep. ad Palladium: αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ, ὡς τεθάῤῥηκα, τοῖς ἀσθενοῦσιν ἀσθενὴς γίνεται, ἵνα τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς κερδήσῃ. cf. Garnier vita Basilii p. 95 ss. That Basil made up his view of the Holy Spirit from Plotinian ideas of the ideal world, and the world of soul, is shown by A. Jahn, Basilius Magnus plotinizans. Bernae 1838. 4. When Gregory of Nazianzum preached the deity of the Holy Spirit openly, it was objected to him (orat. theol. v. de Spir. S. § 1.): πόθεν ἡμῖν ἐπεισάγεις ξένον θεὸν καὶ ἄγραφον; and he admitted § 26: ἐκήρυσσε φανερῶς ἡ παλαιὰ τὸν Πατέρα, τὸν Υἱὸν ἀμυδρότερον· ἐφανέρωσεν ἡ καινὴ τὸν Υἱὸν, ὑπέδειξε τοῦ Πνεύματος τὴν θεότητα· ἐμπολιτεύεται νῦν τὸ Πνεῦμα, σαφεστέραν ἡμῖν παρέχον τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δήλωσιν.

[28] See below § 84. note 24.

[29] cf. Eudoxii Ariani fragm. (in Maji scriptt. vett. nova coll. vii. 1, 17): πιστεύομεν—εἰς ἕνα κύριον,—σαρκωθέντα, οὐκ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα· οὔτε γὰρ ψυχὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ἀνείληφεν, ἀλλὰ σὰρξ γέγονεν·—οὐ δύο φύσεις· ἐπεὶ μὴ τέλειος ἦν ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ἀντὶ ψυχῆς θεὸς ἐν σαρκί. Lucii Alexandrini Ariani fragm. l. c. διὰ τοῦτο βοᾷ τὴν ἀλήθειαν Ἰωάννης· ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, ἀντὶ τοῦ, συνετέθη σαρκί, οὐ μὴν ψυχῇ.—Εἰ δὲ καὶ ψυχὴν εἶχεν,—μάχεται τὰ κινήματα θεοῦ καὶ ψυχῆς· αὐτοκίνητον γὰρ τούτων ἑκάτερον, καὶ πρὸς ἐνεργείας διαφόρους ἀγόμενον. Fragm. Arian. xiii. Majus l. c. iii. ii. 228.

[30] Comp. Baur's Dreieinigkeit i. 559. So early as in the epist. synod. Conc. Alex. A.D. 362, in which even delegates of Apollinaris took part, we find, but without the name of the latter, the polemic declaration: ὡμολόγουν γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο, ὅτι οὐ σῶμα ἄψυχον, οὐδ' ἀναίσθητον, οὐδ' ἀνόητον εἶχεν ὁ σωτῆρ. This opinion is also contradicted by Athanasius, especially in epist. ad Epictetum (371), contra Apollinarium libb. ii. (372), yet without naming Apollinaris (see Möhler's Athanasius Th. 2. S. 263 ff.), although Epiphanius haer. 77. considers those works as refutations of it. Basil the Great heard of the heresy of Apollinaris in 373 (ep. 129 ad Meletium), and wrote about it 374 (ep. 264 ad occidentales, and ep. 265 ad Aegyptios). Fragments of the writings of Apollinaris belonging to the present subject (περὶ ἐνσαρκώσεως, περὶ πίστεως) are preserved chiefly in Gregory of Nyssa and Theodoret. Fragments of several epistles of Apollinaris are found in Leontius Byzant. (about 590) adv. fraudes Apollinaristarum libb. 2. (ex. lat. vers. Turriani in Canisii lectt. ant. ed. Basnage i. 608 ss. Gallandii bibl. PP. xii. 706). Scattered fragments of every kind are in Majii scriptt. vett. nova coll. Tom. vii.

Thus *Theodosius*, who as a Spaniard was a zealous adherent of the Nicene council, found at his accession to the throne of the west (379,) universal toleration; in the east Arianism prevalent—the Homousiasts persecuted, and besides them the parties of the

P. i. Answers to Apollinaris were written by Diodorus Tarsensis, Theodotus Antiochenus, and the two bishops of Alexandria, Theophilus and Cyril. Still extant are Gregorii Naz. ep. ad Nectarium or orat. 46, and epp. ii. ad Cledonium or orat. 51 and 52 (Ullmann's Greg. von Naz. S. 401 ff.): and the far more important Gregorii Nysseni *ἀντιῤῥητικὸς πρὸς τὰ Ἀπολιναρίου* (prim. ed. Zacagnius monim. veter. eccl. Gr. and in Gallandii bibl. PP. vi. 517). Nemesius de natura hominis c. 1. *Τινὲς μὲν, ὧν ἐστι καὶ Πλωτῖνος, ἄλλην εἶναι τὴν ψυχὴν, καὶ ἄλλον τὸν νοῦν δογματίσαντες, ἐκ τριῶν τὸν ἄνθρωπον συνεστάναι βούλονται, σώματος, καὶ ψυχῆς, καὶ νοῦ. Οἷς ἠκολούθησε καὶ Ἀπολινάριος, ὁ τῆς Λαοδικείας γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος· τοῦτον γὰρ πηξάμενος τὸν θεμέλιον τῆς ἰδίας δόξης, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ προσῳκοδόμησε κατὰ τὸ οἰκεῖον δόγμα.* Apollinarius ap. Greg. Nyss. c. 35: *ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἷς ἐστιν ἐκ πνεύματος καὶ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος.*—c. 9: *τὸ δὴ πνεῦμα, τουτέστι τὸν νοῦν, θεὸν ἔχων ὁ Χριστὸς μετὰ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος, εἰκότως ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ λέγεται* (1 Cor. xv. 47 ss.).—c. 7: *θεὸς μέν (ἐστι) τῷ πνεύματι τῷ σαρκωθέντι, ἄνθρωπος δὲ τῇ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ προσληφθείσῃ σαρκί.*—c. 23: *οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄνθρωπος* (Phil. ii. 7.), *διότι οὐχ ὁμοούσιος τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ κατὰ τὸ κυριώτατον.*—c. 39: *εἰ ἀνθρώπῳ τελείῳ συνήφθη θεὸς τέλειος, δύο ἂν ἦσαν,* (c. 42): *εἷς μὲν φύσει υἱὸς θεοῦ, εἷς δὲ θετός.*—c. 48: *εἰ ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἴσων ἡμῖν ἐστι τοις χοϊκοις ὁ ἐπουράνιος ἄνθρωπος (ὥστε καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἴσον ἔχειν τοῖς χοϊκοῖς), οὐκ ἐπουράνιος, ἀλλ' ἐπουρανίου θεοῦ δοχεῖον.*—c. 44: *Ἡ σὰρξ τοῦ Κυρίου προσκυνειται, καθὸ ἓν ἐστι, πρόσωπον καὶ ἓν ζῶον μετ' αὐτοῦ. Μηδὲν ποίημα προσκυνητὸν μετὰ τοῦ Κυρίου, ὡς ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ.* From this resulted the principle of one nature in Christ, Apoll. fragm. ap. Majum vii. i. 16: *μιᾷ δὲ συγκράτῳ τῇ φύσει ἄνθρωπον τὸν κύριον λέγομεν, μιᾷ δὲ συγκράτῳ τῇ φύσει σαρκικῇ τε καὶ θεϊκῇ.* In another fragment Apollinaris designates the entire spiritual principle in man as *ψυχή*, and makes the place of it in Christ be supplied by the Logos. Ap. Majum vii. i. 203: *ὁ Ἰωάννης—εἰπὼν, ὅτι ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, οὐ προσέθηκε, καὶ ψυχή· ἀδύνατον γὰρ δύο νοερὰ καὶ θελητικὰ ἐν τῷ ἅμα κατοικειν, ἵνα μὴ τὸ ἕτερον κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου ἀντιστρατεύηται διὰ τῆς οἰκείας θελήσεως καὶ ἐνεργείας. Οὐκοῦν οὐ ψυχῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἐπελάβετο ὁ λόγος, ἀλλὰ μόνου σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ· τὸ γὰρ τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ ναὸν προδιέγραψεν ὁ ἄψυχος καὶ ἄνους καὶ ἀθελὴς τοῦ Σολομῶντος ναός.* Some of his disciples, especially Polemius (Polemiani), taught *ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν κατεληλυθέναι τοῦ Κυρίου τὸ σῶμα, ὁμοούσιον τὸ σῶμα τ. Χρ. τῇ θεότητι.* Epiph. haer. 77. § 2. 20. Theodoret. haer. fab. iv. 9. Chr. A. Salig de Eutychianismo ante Eutychen. Guelpherb. 1723. 4.—From this time forward the threefold division of man began to be considered heterodox. Keilii opusc. acad. T. ii. p. 641 ss.

[31] *Συνουσιασταί*, because they taught, *συνουσίωσιν γεγενῆσθαι καὶ κρᾶσιν τῆς θεότητος καὶ τοῦ σώματος* (Theodoret. haer. fab. comp. iv. 9). Hence Theodotus of Antioch, and Diodorus of Tarsus, wrote *κατὰ Συνουσιαστῶν.* Dimoeritae apud Epiphan. haer. 77.

Photinians, Macedonians, and Apollinarists, with innumerable older sects. After conquering the Goths, he began forthwith to declare Homousianism to be the catholic faith, and to persecute other parties.[32] The more effectually to remove existing evils, he summoned *a general council at Constantinople* (381),[33] by which the schism between the Nicenes was peaceably removed,[34] and the Nicene creed enlarged with additions directed against heretics who had risen up since its origin.[35] *Valentinian II.*

[32] A law of the year 380. Cod. Theod. xvi. 1, 2. Cunctos populos, quos clementiae nostrae regit temperamentum, in tali volumus religione versari, quam divinum Petrum Apostolum tradidisse Romanis religio usque nunc ab ipso insinuata declarat, quamque pontificem Damasum sequi claret, et Petrum, Alexandriae episcopum, virum apostolicae sanctitatis: hoc est ut secundum apostolicam disciplinam evangelicamque doctrinam Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti unam deitatem sub parili majestate et sub pia trinitate credamus. Hanc legem sequentes Christianorum catholicorum nomen jubemus amplecti, reliquos vero dementes vesanosque judicantes, haeretici dogmatis infamiam sustinere, nec conciliabulo eorum ecclesiarum nomen accipere, divina primum vindicta, post etiam motus nostri, quem ex caelesti arbitrio sumserimus, ultione plectendos. Ullmann's Gregor. v. Naz. S. 220 ff. Stuffken diss. de Theodos. M. in rem Christ. meritis. Lugd. Bat. 1828. 8. p. 135 ss.

[33] *οἱ ρν'*. Respecting it see Fuchs Bibl. d. Kirchenverf. ii. 390. Ullmann S. 238. Stuffken p. 142.

[34] To this Synod Meletius, as bishop of Antioch, was summoned, not Paulinus, with whom the westerns communicated, and was even a *πρόεδρος* of the council (Gregorii Naz. carmen de vita sua, v. 1514). When he died during the council, Flavianus was appointed to succeed him, without reference to Paulinus (Ullmann S. 245). The schism did not entirely disappear till A.D. 413 (Theodoret v. 35).

[35] Symb. Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum: *Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων, καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο. Τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα· σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ παθόντα καὶ ταφέντα καὶ ἀναστάντα ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς· καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τὸ κύριον* (according to 2 Cor. iii. 17. See Theodoret. ad h. l.), *τὸ ζωοποιὸν* (according to Joh. vi. 63), *τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον* (according to Joh. xv. 26), *τὸ σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν· εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν· προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν· καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος· Ἀμήν.* J. C. Suicer Symbolum Nicaeno Constantinopol. expositum et

allowed the Arians in the west to enjoy freedom of religion some years longer;[36] but the case was quite altered by Theodosius,[37] and a universal suppression of the sect ensued. The last traces of its existence in the Byzantine empire appear under the emperor Anastasius at Constantinople 491—518.[38]

The subject of the controversy was merely the point of similarity in essence between the three persons. The unity and equality of the persons, which necessarily resulted from holding similarity of essence, was not fully acknowledged at once even by

ex antiquitate ecclesiastica illustratum. Traj. ad Rhen. 1718. 4. Already about 375 a Roman synod under Damasus had declared Sp. S. cum Patre et Filio unius potestatis esse atque substantiae (Mansi iii. 482), and an Illyrian synod, ὁμοούσιον εἶναι τὴν τριάδα Πατρὸς, Υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος (Theodoret. iv. 8.): But in Constantinople they did not yet venture to give utterance to any unbiblical formulas respecting the Holy Spirit, in order not to stir up new controversies in the east, where there were still so many opponents of his deity.—Immediately after the close of the council, Theodosius passed the law of the 30th July 381. (Cod. Theodos. xvi. 1, 3.): Episcopis tradi omnes Ecclesias mox jubemus, qui unius majestatis atque virtutis Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum confitentur, ejusdem gloriae, claritatis unius; nihil dissonum profana divisione facientes, sed Trinitatis ordinem, personarum adsertionem, et divinitatis unitatem: quos constabit communione Nectarii Episc. Constantinopolitanae Ecclesiae, Timothei necnon intra Aegyptum Alexandrinae urbis Episcopi esse sociatos: quos etiam in Orientis partibus Pelagio Ep. Laodicensi, et Diodoro Ep. Tarsensi; in Asia necnon proconsulari atque Asiana Dioecesi Amphilochio Ep. Iconiensi, et Optimo Ep. Antiocheno (of Antioch in Pisidia); in Pontica dioecesi Helladio Ep. Caesariensi, et Otrejo Meliteno, et Gregorio Ep. Nysseno; Terennio Ep. Scythiae, Marmario Ep. Marcianop. communicare constiterit: hos ad obtinendas catholicas Ecclesias ex communione et consortio probabilium sacerdotum oportebit admitti etc. In like manner there followed laws against heretics, which were often repeated. See Cod. Theodos. xvi. 5 de Haereticis L. 6—14. 16. 17. 19. 21—23.

[36] At the instance of his Arian mother Justina, Cod. Th. xvi. 1, 4 (A.D. 386), cf. Ambros. epist. 20, 21, 22. Rufini hist. eccl. ii. 15. In the meantime, however, but a small number of Arians had gathered around the empress at Milan. Cf. epist. ii. Conc. Aquilej. ann. 381 ad Impp. ap. Mansii iii. p. 623: per occidentales partes duobus in angulis antum, hoc est in latere Daciae Ripensis ac Moesiae fidei obstrepi videbatur.

[37] When driven away by Maximus he found refuge with Theodosius. His law against the heretics, A.D. 388, see Cod. Theod. xvi. 5, 15. Cf. Gothofred. ad h. legem. Soon after even an Arian in the west wrote in defence of his doctrinal creed. See the interesting reliquiae tractatus in Lucae Evang. and fragmenta sermonum in Ang. Maji scriptorum veterum nova collectio. T. iii. P. ii.

[38] Theodorus Lector ii. p. 562 fragm. p. 582.

the Nicenians,[39] but continued to be more clearly perceived,[40] until at last it was expressed by *Augustine* for the first time with decided logical consequence.[41]

§ 84.

HISTORY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SCIENCES DURING THE ARIAN DISPUTES.

Among the theological schools of this period the most distinguished were *that of Origen*, and *the Syrian historico-exegetical*, whose origin belongs to the preceding period. *Origen* enjoyed the highest esteem, and it is to be attributed to the wide-extended influence of his writings that, notwithstanding these furious theological disputes, a freedom of discussion was still preserved. In the great questions of the time, both parties could appeal to him.[1] When the Arians referred to the declaration in his own

[39] Comp. especially Hilarii de trin. iii. 12: Et quis non Patrem potiorem confitebitur, ut ingenitum a genito, ut Patrem a Filio, ut eum qui miserit ab eo qui missus sit, ut volentem ab eo qui obediat? Et ipse nobis erit testis: Pater major me est. iv. 16: Dicit ergo fieri Deus ex quo omnia sunt, et facit Deus per quem omnia (according to 1 Cor. viii. 6). Haec distinctio jubentis Dei, et facientis Dei.

[40] Even Athanasius retracted the old proposition that the Son exists by the will of the Father, Orat. adv. Arianos i. (formerly ii.) 29: τὸ δὲ γέννημα οὐ βουλήσει ὑπόκειται, ἀλλὰ τῆς οὐσίας ἐστὶν ἰδιότης.

[41] Augustinus de trin. vii. 11. Non major essentia est Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus simul, quam solus Pater, aut solus Filius: sed tres simul illae substantiae (ὑποστάσεις) sive personae, si ita dicendae sunt, aequales sunt singulis: quod animalis homo non percipit. 12. Pater, et Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus unus Deus. Id. contra sermonem Arianorum § 4. Unus Deus est ipsa Trinitas, et sic unus Deus, quomodo unus creator: quid est quod dicunt, jubente Patre creasse omnia Filium, tanquam Pater non creaverit, sed a Filio creari jusserit? Formant sibi in phantasmate cordis sui quasi duos aliquos, etsi juxta invicem, in suis tamen locis constitutos, unum jubentem, alterum obtemperantem. Nec intelligunt, ipsam jussionem Patris, ut fierent omnia, non esse nisi Verbum Patris, per quod facta sunt omnia. Against the old opinion that the Father is absolutely invisible, and that the Logos alone can appear, see de trin. ii. 15 ss. Cf. § 35: Ipsa natura, vel substantia, vel essentia, vel quolibet alio nomine appellandum est id ipsum quod Deus est, quidquid illud est, corporaliter videri non potest: per subjectam vero creaturam non solum Filium vel Spiritum Sanctum, sed etiam Patrem corporali specie sive similitudine mortalibus sensibus significationem sui dare potuisse credendum est.

[1] Hence the contradictory opinions concerning him. Epiphanius

writings, and in those of his disciples Dionysius and Theognostus, that the Son is a creature, Athanasius on the contrary drew from the same source arguments for the eternal generation of the Logos.[2] Men were the less perplexed by contrary passages in his writings, inasmuch as they knew and already practised many expedients for the purpose of making such expressions of the fathers as were contradictory to the more modern views, powerless and void.[3] Thus Origen had adherents among both parties. Among the Eusebians, he had in particular *Eusebius Pamphili*, bishop of Caesarea, in Palestine († 340), a man distinguished alike for his love of peace and his merits as a church historian.[4] Among the Nicenians, were *Athanasius*, the father

haer. 64, c. 4, declares him to be the father of Arianism; and Socrates vii. 6 wonders how Timotheus could have been at the same time an admirer of Origen and an Arian, since Origen *συναίδιον παντὰχοῦ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τῷ πατρί.*

[2] See Div. I, § 63, note 18. Comp. Münscher's Dogmengeschichte. Bd. 3. S. 416, 418 ff.

[3] See Münscher l. c. S. 156 ff. 422 ff.

[4] His biography, composed by his successor Acacius (Socrat. ii. 4), is lost. He is called an Arian by Athanasius, Epiphanius, Hilary, Jerome, &c., defended by Socrat. ii. 21, and Gelasius hist. Syn. Nic. ii. 1. The first are followed by most historians, as Baronius, Petavius (dogm. theol. de trin. lib. ii. c. 11), Arnold, Jac. Basnage, &c. On the contrary, he is declared to be orthodox by Valesius, Bull, du Pin, Sam. Basnage. There was a controversy on the subject between Jo. Le Clerc, who accuses him of Arianism (bibliothèque univ. T. x. p. 380. Epistolae criticae s. Artis criticae, vol. iii. p. 28 ss.), and W. Cave, who, on the other hand, defends him (diss. de Eusebii Arianismo in the append. ii. hist. literar. script. eccl. p. 42. u. epist. apolog. ibid. p. 61 ss.) A more correct opinion is given by Chr. D. A. Martini Eusebii Caes. de divinitate Christi sententia. Rostoch. 1795. 4. J. Ritter Eusebii Caes. de divinitate Christi placita. Bonnae 1823. 4. Writings: Hist. eccl. libb. x. Chronicon s. *παντοδαπὴ ἱστορία* (ex. vers. Armen. ed. J. Bapt. Aucher. Venet. 2 T. 1818. 4. Ang. Majus et J. Zohrab., Mediol. 1818. 4., integrius et emendatius ed Ang. Majus in Scriptt. vet. nova coll., tom. viii. Romae 1833. 4.) *Προπαρασκευὴ εὐαγγελικὴ* libb. 15, ed. F. Vigerus. Paris. 1628. fol. F. A. Heinichen. 2 T. Lips. 1842. 8. *Εὐαγγελικὴ ἀπόδειξις* lib. 20 (of this lib. i.—x. ed. Par. 1628. fol. The beginning of the first and close of the tenth book, which are there wanting, have been supplied by J. A. Fabricius in his delectus argumentorum et syllabus scriptt. qui veritatem relig. christ. adseruerunt. Hamb. 1725. 4. p. 1 ss.) Contra Hieroclem liber. (C. Gu. Haenell de Euseb. Caes. religionis christ. defensore. Gottingae 1843. 8.) Contra Marcellum libb. 2. De ecclesiastica Theologia libb. 3 (all appended to the demonstr. evangel.) *Περὶ τῶν τοπικῶν ἐν τῇ Θείᾳ γραφῇ* (cum vers. Hieronymi ed. J. Clericus. Amst. 1707. fol.) Oratio de laudibus Constantini. De vita Constantini libb. 4 (annexed

of orthodoxy, from the year 326 bishop of Alexandria, frequently banished and again recalled (†373);[5] *Basil* the great, from the year 370, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia († 379);[6] his brother *Gregory*, from 370 bishop of Nyssa in Cappadocia († about 394);[7] *Gregory of Nazianzum*, ὁ Θεόλογος, the intimate friend of Basil, bishop of Constantinople from 380—381 († 390); and *Didymus*, president of the catechetical school in Alexandria, († 395).[9] Even towards the west also, where they were accus-

to the hist. eccl.) Canones sacr. Evangeliorum x. (in bibl. PP.) Comm. in Cant. Canticorum, in Psalmos, in Esaiam. Eclogae propheticae e cod. Vindebon. primum ed. Thom. Gaisford. Oxon. 1842. 8. Cf. Fabricii bibl. Gr. ed. Harles. vol. vii. p. 335 ss.

[5] See particularly Ἀπολογητικὸς κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν (about 349). Ἀπολογία πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Κωνστάντιον (356). Ἀπολογία περὶ τῆς φυγῆς αὐτοῦ (357). Ἐπιστολὴ τοῖς τὸν μονήρη βίον ἀσκοῦσι s. historia Arianorum ad Monachos (358). Κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν λόγοι δ'. Ἐπιστολὴ περὶ τῶν γενομένων ἐν τῇ Ἀριμίνῳ τῆς Ἰταλίας καὶ ἐν Σελευκείᾳ τῆς Ἰσαυρίας συνόδων (359), &c. Opp. ed Bern. de Montfaucon. Paris 1698. 3 T. fol. N. A. Justiniani. Patav. 1777. 4 T. fol. Cf. Fabricius-Harles viii. 171. J. A. Möhler's Athanasius d. G. u. die Kirche seiner Zeit. 2 Th. Mainz 1827. 8.

[6] Ἀντιῤῥητικὸς τοῦ Ἀπολογητικοῦ τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς Εὐνομίου libb. v. Περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (comp. § 83, note 27). Homilies (C. Gu. van der Pot de Basilio M. oratore sacro. Amstel. 1835. 8. Paniel's Gesch. d. christl. Beredsamkeit i. 464). Ascetic writings, letters. Opp. ed. Fronto Ducaeus. Paris 1618. 2 voll. fol. Jul. Garnier. Par. 1721 ss. 3 voll. fol. ed ii. cur. L. de Sinner. Paris. 1839. 3 tomi 8. A. Jahnii animadversiones in S. Basilii M. opera. Bernae et S. Galli 1842. fasc. 1. Cf. Fabricius-Harles ix. 1. J. E. Feisser diss. de vita Basilii M. Groningae 1828. 8. Basilius d. G. nach s. Leben u. s. Lehre dargestellt von Dr C. R. W. Klose. Stralsund 1835. 8.

[7] Κατᾶ Εὐνομίου libb. xiii. Contra Apollinarem see § 83, note 29. Περὶ τῆς ἑξαημέρου. Λόγος κατηχητικὸς ὁ μέγας. (Oratio catechetica. rec. G. Krabinger. Acc. ejusdem Gregorii oratio funebris in Meletium Episc. Antiochenum. Monachii 1835. 8.) De anima et resurrectione (ed. Krabinger. 1837.) De precatione oratt. v. (ed. Krabinger, 1840). Respecting his homilies see Paniel i. 520. Opp. ed. F. Morellius. Paris 1615. 2 voll. Append. add. J. Gretser ibid. 1618. fol. Cf. Fabricius-Harles ix. 98. Greger's des Bisch. v. Nyssa Leben u. Meinungen, von Dr J. Rupp. Leipzig 1834. 8.

[8] Regarding his orations (among which must be particularly distinguished de theologia oratt. v.), see Paniel. i. 493. Letters, poems. Opp. ed. F. Morellius. Paris. 1630 (Colon. 1690) 2 voll. fol. ed. Clemencet Tom. i. Paris 1778. Tom. ii. ed. D. A. B. Caillau. Paris 1840. fol. Cf. Fabricius-Harles viii. 383. Gregorius v. Nazianz, der Theologe, von D. C. Ullmann. Darmstadt 1825. 8.

[9] Respecting him see Guerike de schola Alex. P. i. p. 92 ss. His biblical commentaries, and his Comm. in libros Origenis περὶ ἀρχῶν, are, with many other writings, no longer extant. Still extant: Lib. de

tomed to derive their knowledge uninterruptedly from the Greek literature,[10] Origen's influence had extended, and the most important occidental writers of this period, *Hilary*, bishop of Pictavium from A.D. 350, living an exile in Phrygia from 356—360 († 368);[11] the Luciferian *Hilary*, deacon in Rome (about 380),[12] and *Ambrose*, bishop of Mediolanum from 374 († 397),[13] honoured and employed him as a teacher. So also the two distinguished western monks living in Palestine, *Tyrannius Rufinus* of Aquileia,[14] who had been six years a pupil of Didymus in Egypt, but since the year 378, had led an ascetic life on the Mount of Olives († 410), and *Sophronius Eusebius Hieronymus* of *Stridon*, the first scriptural expositor of his day, who lived at the head of a society of monks in Bethlehem from A.D. 386 († 420).[15]

Spiritu S., according to the Latin version of Jerome (in Hieron. Opp. ed. Martian. T. iv. P. i. p. 494 ss.); lib. adv. Manichaeos (gr. et lat. in Combefisii auctarium graec. PP. P. ii. p. 21, and in Canisii lectt. ant. ed. Basnage. vol. i. p. 204 ss.); de Trinitate libb. iii. (prim. ed. J. A. Mingarelli. Bonon. 1769. fol.); brevis enarratio in epistt. canonicas, preserved, in the Latin translation composed at the request of Cassiodorus, by Epiphanius Scholasticus (see Cassiod. de instit. div. scr. c. 8), among others in the bibl. max. PP. T. iv. p. 319 ss., best of all in Lücke quaestiones ac vindiciae Didymianae., Gotting. 1829—32. 4 particulae. 4., where it is accompanied by the Greek text, partially restored from the Scholia of Matthaei.

[10] Paniel's Gesch. d. christl. Beredsamkeit i. 663.

[11] De trinitate libb. xii. Ad. Constantium lib. De Synodis adv. Arianos. De Synodis Ariminensi et Seleuciensi (fragments). Various commentaries. Of the comm. in Psalmos plurimos Hieron. cat. c. 100: in quo opere imitatus Origenem, nonnulla etiam de suo addidit: respecting the treatises no longer extant called tractatus in Job: quos de Graeco Origenis ad sensum transtulit, cf. Rosenmüller hist. interpret. libr. sacr. in eccl. christ. P. iii. p. 301 ss. Paniel i. 697. Bähr's christl. römische Theologie. S. 113. Opp. edd. Monachi Congreg. S. Mauri (P. Coustant). Paris 1693. Sc. Maffeus. Veron. 1730. 2 voll. fol.

[12] The author of the comm. in xiii. epistt. b. Pauli in the works of Ambrose (hence Ambrosiaster), and probably, too, of the quaestiones vet. et novi test. in the works of Augustine (in the Appendix of Tom. iii. P. ii. Benedictine edition). Comp. R. Simon hist. crit. des principaux commentateurs du N. T. p. 133.

[13] De officiis Ministrorum libb. 3 (ed. Dr R. O. Gilbert. Lips. 1839. 8.) Hexaëmeron (ed. Gilbert. Lips. 1840. 8). De fide libb. 5. De Spiritu Sancto libb. 3. A useless commentary on some of the Psalms, in Lucam libb. 10 (cf. Rosenmüller l. c. p. 315 ss.) Epistolae 92, &c. Opp. edd. Mon. Congreg. S. Mauri. Paris 1686. 90. 2 voll. fol. Comp. Bähr S. 142.

[14] Respecting his writings, see below § 85, note 4.

In addition to the Origenist school, the Syrian *historico-exegetical* school in the east had many friends.[16] To it belonged, among the Eusebians: *Theodore*, bishop of Heraclea († about 358),[17] *Eusebius, bishop of Emesa* († 360),[18] and *Cyril*, bishop of

[15] At that time Jerome wrote to Paula respecting Origen (Rufin. invectiv. in Hieron. lib. ii. see Hieron. opp. ed. Martianay vol. iv. T. ii. p. 68 and 480): Quis enim unquam tanta legere potuit, quanta ipse conscripsit: Pro hoc sudore, quid accepit pretii? Damnatur a Demetrio episcopo: exceptis Palaestinae et Arabiae et Phoenices atque Achajae sacerdotibus in damnationem ejus consentit (add. orbis). urbs Roma ipsa contra hunc cogit senatum, non propter dogmatum novitatem, non propter haeresin, ut nunc adversum eum rabidi canes simulant, sed quia gloriam eloquentiae ejus et scientiae ferre non poterant, et illo dicente omnes muti putabantur. See a notice of his writings in § 85 note 5.

[16] Cf. J. A. Ernesti narratio crit. de interpretatione prophetiarum messian. in opp. theol. p. 498 ss. F. Münter über die antiochen. Schule in Staüdlin's and Tzschirner's Archiv. f. Kirchengesch. i. i. 13. Caes. a Lengerke de Ephraemi Syri arte hermeneutica liber. Regimontii Pruss. 1831. 8. p. 60.

[17] Hieronymi catal. c. 90: Theodorus Heracliae Thraciarum Episcopus, elegantis apertique sermonis, et magis historicae intelligentiae, edidit sub Constantio Principe commentarios in Matthaeum, et in Joannem, et in Apostolum, et in Psalterium. The commentary on the Psalms in Corderii catena in Psalmos. Antv. 1643: other exegetical fragments in the Catenae. The most are to be found in Corderii catena in Matthaeum. Antverp. 1642. H. F. Massmann (Skeireins, Auslegung d. Ev. Joh. in goth. Sprache, München 1834. 4.) considers the fragments published by him to be the remains of a Gothic version of Theodore's commentary on John. Of a contrary opinion Dr Julius Loebe Beiträge zur Textberichtigung u. Erklärung der Skeireins. Altenburg 1839. 8. S. 4.

[18] Respecting him see Socrates ii. 9, and Sozomenus iii. 6. Both say of him: ὑπέμεινε δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς μέμψιν, ὡς τὰ Σαβελλίου φρονῶν. On the contrary, he is called in Jerome in chron. ad ann. x. Constantii: Arianae signifer factionis. Cf. Hieron. cat. c. 91: Eusebius Emesenus Episcopus, elegantis et rhetorici ingenii, innumerabiles, et qui ad plausum populi pertinent, confecit libros, magisque historiam secutus, ab his qui declamare volunt, studiosissime legitur: e quibus vel praecipui sunt adv. Judaeos, et Gentes, et Novatianos, et ad Galatas libb. x., et in Evangelia homiliae breves sed plurimae. His exegetical character is more distinctly drawn, c. 119 (see below note 22). Thilo (über die Schriften des Eusebius v. Alexandrien u. d. Eusebius v. Emisa. Halle 1832. 8.) shows that the three discourses published by Augusti (Euseb. Emes. quae supersunt opuscula. Elberfeldi 1829. 8.) do not belong to Eusebius of Emesa, but, along with many others, to one Eusebius of Alexandria, belonging to the fifth or sixth century (an old life of this Alexandrian and several discourses are extant in the spicilegium Romanum T. ix. Romae 1843. 8.) Among the extant writings of Eusebius of Emesa (on them see Thilo p. 56), the most important would be the two books de fide adv. Sabellium in the opuscula xiv. Eusebii Pamph. ed. J. Sirmond

Jerusalem, who afterward adopted the decrees of the Nicene council, and was present at the council of Constantinople (381), († 386).[19] Among the oriental Nicenians, *Apollinaris*, bishop of Laodicea, (between 370 and 390),[20] known by his heresy respecting the person of Christ; *Ephraem*, deacon in Edessa, the prophet of the Syrians († 378);[21] and *Diodore*, presbyter in Antioch, bishop of Tarsus from 378 († before 394),[22] were attached

Paris 1643 (also in bibl. PP. Lugd. iv. 1), if it could be proved that they really belong to him. Thilo makes it probable, p. 64.

[19] Catecheses xviii. ad Competentes, Catecheses mystagogicae v., probably delivered in the year 347 (their authenticity has been denied especially by Oudinus de scriptt. eccl. ant. vol. i. p. 459 ss.), but proved by Toutée in the dissert. Cyrill. p. xciii., prefixed to his edition), ed. Th. Milles. Oxon. 1703. fol. A. A. Touttée. Paris 1720. fol. Comp. J. J. van Vollenhoven spec. theol. de Cyrilli Hier. catechesibus. Amstelod. 1837. 8. Paniel's Gesch. der christl. Beredsamkeit i. 419. Against the Semiarianism of the saint, which is acknowledged by Touttée dissertt. Cyrill. p. xi. ss. (which Epiphanius haer. lxxiii. c. 27 also expressly attests) appeared the Jesuit Mémoires de Trevoux (mois de Dec. 1721), but they were refuted by (Prudentius Maranus) diss. sur les Sémiariens. Paris 1722. 8., reprinted in Vogt bibl. hist. haeresiolog. ii. 115. Respecting his exposition of Scripture in the Catecheses, see Catech. xiii. c. 9: *συνελήλυθαμεν γὰρ, οὐ γραφῶν ἐξήγησιν θεωρητικὴν ποιήσασθαι νῦν, ἀλλὰ πιστοποιηθῆναι μᾶλλον περὶ ὧν πεπιστεύκαμεν.* cf. Fabricius-Harles viii. 437. Tzschirner Opusc. acad. p. 253 ss. v. Cölln in Ersch u. Gruber's Encyclopädie xxii. 143.

[20] His writings (adv. Porphyrium libb. xxx., contra Eunomium, &c.) are all lost. Many of his interpretations of Scripture are preserved in the Catenae. Philostorgius ap. Suidam s. v. Apollinaris prefers him to Basil and Gregory of Nazianzum: *οὗτος γὰρ δὴ καὶ τῆς Ἑβραΐδος διαλέκτου ἐπαΐειν οἷός τε ἦν.* cf. Fabricius-Harles. vol. viii. p. 588 ss.

[21] Homilies (cf. Tzchirner opusc. acad. p. 262 ss.), Ascetic Writings, Hymns. Particularly important are his Syriac commentaries on the Old Testament. cf. Caesar a Lengerke comm. crit. de Ephraemo Syro S. S. interprete. Halis. 1828. 4. Ejusd. de Ephr. Syri arte hermeneutica lib. Regimontii Pruss. 1831. 8. Paniel's Gesch. d. christl. Beredsamkeit i. 438. Opp. graeca et syr. ed. St. Evod. Assemanus. Romae 1732—45. 6 voll. fol. cf. Fabricius-Harles. vol. viii. p. 217 ss.

[22] Hieron. cat. c. 119: Diodorus Tarsensis Episcopus, dum Antiochiae esset presbyter, magis claruit. Extant ejus in Apostolum commentarii, et multa alia, ad Eusebii magis Emiseni characterem pertinentia: cujus cum sensum secutus sit, eloquentiam imitari non potuit propter ignorantiam saecularium litterarum. Socrat. vi. 3: *πολλὰ βιβλία συνέγραψε, ψιλῷ τῷ γράμματι τῶν θείων προσέχων γραφῶν, τὰς θεωρίας αὐτῶν ἐκτρεπόμενος.* For his orthodoxy, which was afterwards called in question, see Facundi Ep. Hermianensis (about 548) pro defensione trium Capitulorum lib. iv. c. 2. His writings, which have been all lost, and among them commentaries on most of the biblical books, whose loss must be chiefly regretted,

to it. From the last school proceeded *John Chrysostom*, deacon from 381, 386 presbyter in Antioch, from 398 bishop of Constantinople († 407),[23] and *Theodore*, presbyter in Antioch, from 393 bishop of Mopsuestia († 429,)[24] the most eminent exegetical writer of the Syrian school.

are enumerated by Theodore Victor ap. Suidas s. v. Διόδωρος, and by Ebedjesu in Assemani bibl. orient. iii. i. 28. cf. Fabricius-Harles ix. 278 ss. Fragments are found in Marius Mercator, Photius (cod. 122) and others. Among the Chaldean Christians, who held him in great repute (see Assemani iii. ii. 224), many of his writings may have been preserved in translation.

[23] Although he had been previously distinguished by similar honourable surnames (thus he is called in Proclus, bishop of Constantinople after 437, περὶ παραδόσεως τῆς θείας λειτουργίας in Gallandii bibl. PP. ix. 681 ὁ τὴν γλῶτταν χρυσοῦς Ἰωάννης), yet the surname Chrysostom first occurs in Johannes Moschus (about 630) pratum spirit. c. 131, and is generally employed after Concil. vi. in the year 680. His works are: Orations, among which the homilies on the New Testament writings are also of exegetical importance. Comp. Des Joh. Chrys. auserwählte Homilien (v. d. Unbegreiflichkeit Gottes, 5 Hom. wider die Anomöer) übers. u. mit einer Einleit. über Joh. Chrys. den Homileten von Dr. Ph. Mayer. Nürnberg 1830. Paniel's Gesch. d. christl. Beredsamkeit i. 590.—Ascetic writings, letters. Περὶ ἱερωσύνης libb. vi. (ed. J. A. Bengel. Stuttg. 1725. 8. übers. v. K. F. Hasselbach. Stralsund 1820. 8. von. J. Ritter. Berlin 1821. 8.) Opp. ed. B. de Montfaucon, Paris. 1718—38. 13 voll. fol. ed. 2. emendata et aucta. Paris. 1834—39. 13 Tomi. 8.—cf. Fabricius-Harles viii. 454. A. Neander der h. Joh. Chrysostomus u. d. Kirche bes. des. Orients in dessen Zeitalter. Berlin 1821. 22. 2 Bde. 8.

[24] His noted biblical commentaries have been unfortunately lost with the rest of his writings, except some fragments. Recently complete works of his have been published in the original. See Comm. in Prophetas xii. minores taken from a Vienna MS. in: Theod. Antiocheni Mopsv. Episc. quae supersunt omnia ed. A. F. V. a Wegnern vol. i. Berol. 1834. 8. from a Vatican MS. in A. Maji scriptt. vett. nova coll. T. vi. P. i. Romae 1832; and Comm. in epist. ad Romanos edited by Angelo Mai in the Spicilegium Romanum, Tom. iv. (Romae 1840. 8.) p. 499. The Chaldean Christians, who call him by way of eminence the interpreter (Assemani l. c. T. iii. P. i. p. 36), and have declared in the decrees of councils his expositions to be a standard (Assem. l. c. T. iii. P. ii. p. 227), have still much of his in translations. A catalogue of his works by Ebedjesu ap. Assemani iii. i. 30. cf. Fabricius-Harles x. 346. R. E. Klener symbolae literariae ad Theodorum Antiochenum Mopsvestiae Episc. pertinentes. Gotting. 1836. 8. O. F. Fritzsche de Theod. Mopsvesteni vita et scriptis comm. Halae 1836. 8. Respecting Theodore as an interpreter see Ernesti opusc. theol. p. 502 ss. Rosenmüller hist. interpret. iii. 250. Münter in Stäudlin's und Tzschirner's Archive f. KG. i. i. 17. F. L. Sieffert Theodorus Mopsv. veteris Test. sobrie interpretandi vindex comm. Regiomonti 1827. 8. Comp. among

The difference of the exegetical principles of the two schools gave expression to itself even in controversial writings.[25] This dispute however had an entirely scientific character, and did not prevent them recognising each other's merit. As the Origenist Jerome made diligent use of the interpreters of the Syrian school, so also Origen for the most part stood in high estimation with the Syrians.[26] But small traces of doctrinal controversies are now to be found between the two schools.[27] Those orthodox Origenists did not adopt all the peculiar doctrinal sentiments of their master; nor were these doctrines all reckoned

the accusations of Leontius against Theodore (in Gallandii bibl. PP. xii. 686 s.): xii. aggreditur—gloriam Spiritus Sancti, cum omnes quidem scripturas altas, quas sancti afflatu ejus tradiderunt, humiliter et demisse interpretans, tum vero a numero sacrarum scripturarum—eas separans. xiv. Epistolam Jacobi et alias deinceps aliorum catholicas abrogat et antiquat. xv. Inscriptiones Hymnorum, et Psalmorum, et Canticorum penitus ejecit, et omnes Psalmos judaice ad Zorobabelem et Ezechiam retulit, tribus tantum ad Dominum rejectis. xvi. Immo et sanctorum sanctissimum canticum canticorum—libidinose pro sua et mente et lingua meretricia interpretans, sua supra modum incredibili audacia ex libris sacris abscidit. xvii. duos libros Paralipomenon—et insuper Esdram repudiavit.

[25] The Origenists endeavoured, after the example of Origen, to prove the inadmissibility of the grammatical interpretation, and the necessity of the allegorical. For example Gregorius Nyssenus prooem. in Cant. Cant. Jerome in many places. On the other side wrote Theodore according to Suidas s. v. Διόδωρος: τίς διαφορὰ θεωρίας καὶ ἀλληγορίας. Comp. on this treatise Ernesti opusc. theol. p. 499. Still more energetically did Theodore of Mopsuestia attack the Origenists (Facundas iii. c. 6): in libro de allegoria et historia, quem contra Origenem scripsit, unde et odium Origenianorum incurrit. Ebedjesu cites among Theodore's works quinque tomos adv. Allegoricos (Assemani iii. i. 34. cf. p. 19).

[26] So with the author of the Ἀποκρίσεις πρὸς τοὺς ὀρθοδόξους in Justin Martyr's works, who belongs to Syria, about the year 400 (D. W. Gass Abhandlung über diese Schrift, in Illgen's Zeitschr. f. d. hist. Theol. 1842. iv. 34. Comp. S. 143. 103.), and with Chrysostom (see Ernesti opusc. theol. p. 512. and the programm by J. W. Meyer de Chrysostomo literarum sacr. interprete. P. i. Altorf. 1806. 8. De Ch. l. s. i. ejusque interpretandi modo in V. T. libris hist. obvio. Norimb. 1806. 8. Nova comm. de Chr. l. s. i. P. ii. Erlang. 1814. 15. 4. respecting his exposition of the poetical books of the Old Testament).

[27] Theophili Alex. lib. paschalis i. Hieronymo interprete (Hier. opp. ed Martian. T. iv. P. ii. p. 694): Licet (Apollinaris) adversus Arianos, et Eunomianos scripserit, et Origenem, aliosque haereticos sua disputatione subverterit, tamen, &c. So Apollinaris also defended millenarianism in a work περὶ ἀναστάσεως. Basil. ep. 263. (al. 74.) § 4. Hieron. prooem. in libr. xviii. Jesaiae. Epiph. haer. lxxvii. § 36.

damnable. A pretty wide field for free investigation was still left to reason,[29] and the passion with which the question of the relation of the Son to the Father was discussed made this doctrine so much the test of orthodoxy, almost indeed exclusively so, that they never thought during the Arian controversy of limiting freedom of inquiry on other subjects. *Gregory of Nyssa*[29] and *Didymus*[30] were known as Origenists. Many others held to single points of Origen's creed[31] without being attacked on that account. *Chalcidius*[32] and *Synesius* came to adopt still more remarkable opinions by joining new-Platonism with Christianity; yet the latter was consecrated bishop of Ptolemais by Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, although he gave public expression to his convictions (410).[33] The belief in the inalienable capability

[28] Gregor. Naz. orat. 33. (de theol. i.) in fine: φιλοσόφει μοι περὶ κόσμου ἢ κόσμων, περὶ ὕλης, περὶ ψυχῆς, περὶ λογικῶν φύσεων βελτιόνων τε καὶ χειρόνων, περὶ ἀναστάσεως, κρίσεως, ἀνταποδόσεως, Χριστοῦ παθημάτων. Ἐν τούτοις γὰρ καὶ τὸ ἐπιτυγχάνειν οὐκ ἄχρηστον, καὶ τὸ διαμαρτάνειν ἀκίνδυνον. Even in the west the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls was not yet regarded as heretical. Augustine de libero arbitrio iii. 21: Harum autem quatuor de anima sententiarum, utrum de propagine veniant, an in singulis quibusque nascentibus novae fiant, an in corpora nascentium jam alicubi existentes vel mittantur divinitus, vel inde sua sponte labantur, nullam temere affirmare oportebit. cf. Hieron. epist. 126. (al. 82.) ad Marcellinam et Anapsychiam.

[29] See Jo. Dallaeus de poenis et satisfactionibus humanis (libb. vii. Amst. 1649. 4.) lib. iv. c. 7. p. 368 ss. Münscher's Dogmengesch. iv. 439. 465. Wundemann's Gesch. d. christl. Glaubenslehren ii. 463. Rupp's Gregor v. Nyssa S. 243.

[30] On this theology see Guerike de schola Alex. P. ii. p. 332 ss., especially on the pre-existence of souls p. 361, and the possible conversion of the devil p. 359. 368. especially Lücke quaestiones ac vindiciae Didymianae P. i. p. 9 ss. Against the former, Gregory of Nazianzum declares himself very decidedly (see Ullmann p. 414 ff.).

[31] The doctrine of Hilary regarding the humanity of Christ de trin. x. was made up from the opinions of Clement of Alexandria and Origen. See my Comm., qua Clementis Alex. et Origenis doctrinae de corpore Christi exponuntur. Gotting. 1837. 4: that of C. Marius Victorinus philos. (about 368) in comm. in ep. ad Ephes. i. 4 (Maji scriptt. vett. nova collect. iii. ii. 90. 93. s.), animas nostras et ante mundi constitutionem fuisse, quippe cum sua substantia in aeternis semper extiterint, is Origenistic.

[32] cf. Chalc. comm. in Timaeum Platonis in Hippolyti opp. ed. Fabricius ii. 225. Mosheim ad Cudworth syst. intell. p. 732. regards him as a heathen syncretist. See on the other side Fabricii bibl. lat. i. 556. Brucker hist. philos. iii. 477.

[33] Synesius ep. 105. ad fratrem Euoptium announces why he felt it a

of improvement in all rational beings, and the limited duration of future punishment[34] was so general even in the west[35] and among the opponents of Origen,[36] that whatever may be said of its not having arisen without the influence of Origen's school, it had become entirely independent of his system. On the other hand, millennarianism, although it had been abandoned by most theologians, had still many friends among the people, without their being hereticated on account of it.[37]

hazardous thing to assume the office of a bishop, which had been offered him. Among other things, it is said χαλεπόν ἐστιν, εἰ μὴ καὶ λίαν ἀδύνατον, εἰς ψυχὴν τὰ δι' ἐπιστήμης εἰς ἀπόδειξιν ἐλθόντα δόγματα σαλευθῆναι· οἶδα δ' ὅτι πολλὰ φιλοσοφία τοῖς θρυλλουμένοις πούτοις ἀντιδιατάττεται δόγμασιν. ἀμέλει τὴν ψυχὴν οὐκ ἀξιώσω ποτὲ σώματος ὑστερογενῆ νομίζειν· τὸν κόσμον οὐ φήσω καὶ τἆλλα μέρη συνδιαφθείρεσθαι· τὴν καθωμιλημένην ἀνάστασιν ἱερόν τι καὶ ἀπόῤῥητον ἥγημαι, καὶ πολλοῦ δέω ταῖς τοῦ πλήθους ὑπολήψεσιν ὁμολογῆσαι.—ἢ τοῖς ὀφθαλμιῶσι τὸ σκότος ὠφελιμώτερον, ταύτῃ καὶ τὸ ψεῦδος ὄφελος εἶναι τίθεμαι δήμῳ, καὶ βλαβερὸν τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῖς οὐκ ἰσχύουσιν ἐνατενίσαι πρὸς τὴν τῶν ὄντων ἐνάργειαν. εἰ ταῦτα καὶ οἱ τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἱερωσύνης συγχωροῦσιν ἐμοὶ νόμοι, δυναίμην ἂν ἱερᾶσθαι, τὰ μὲν οἴκοι φιλοσοφῶν, τὰ δ' ἔξω φιλομυθῶν.—οὐ βούλομαι δὲ καταλελεῖφθαί τινα περὶ ἐμοῦ λόγον, ὡς ἀγνοηθείς ἥρπασα τὴν χειροτονίαν· ἀλλ' εἰδὼς ὁ θεοφιλέστατος πατὴρ Θεόφιλος, καὶ ὡς ἐπίσταται, σαφές μοι ποιήσας, οὕτω βουλευσάσθω περὶ ἐμοῦ. cf. Evagrius i. c. 15. Photius cod. 26. Comp. Synesius des Kyrenäers Rede an Arkadios, griesch. u. deutsch v. Krabinger. München 1825. 8. Einl. S. xix. ff. Even when bishop, Synesius continued true to his philosophical system. cf. Luc. Holstenii diss. de Synesio, in the app. of Theodoretus, &c. ed. Valesii p. 202. Aem. Th. Clausen de Synesio philosopho, Libyae Pentapoleos metropolita. Hafniae 1831. 8.

[34] Hieronymus ad Gal. v. 22: nullam rationabilium creaturarum apud Deum perire perpetuo. cf. ad Eph. iv. 16. Ambrosiaster in Eph. iii. 10. J. A. Dietelmair commenti fanatici de rerum omnium ἀποκαταστάσει hist. antiquior. Altorfii 1769. 8. p. 160 ss.

[35] Augustini Enchirid. ad Laurent. c. 112: Frustra nonnulli, immo quam plurimi, aeternam damnatorum poenam et cruciatus sine intermissione perpetuos humano miserentur affectu, atque ita futurum esse non credunt: non quidem scripturis divinis adversando, sed pro suo modo dura quaeque molliendo et in leniorem flectendo sententiam, quae putant in eis terribilius esse dicta quam verius. Non enim obliviscetur, inquiunt, misereri Deus, aut continebit in ira sua miserationes suas. (Ps. lxxvii. 10.)

[36] In Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, whose expressions on the subject have been preserved by Salomo, bishop of Bassora (about 1222), in Assemani bibl. or. iii. i. 323. Respecting Theodore comp. Photii cod. 81, Marius Mercator p. 346. ed. Baluzii.

[37] Hieronymus procem. in lib. xviii. in Esaiam: Nec ignoro, quanta inter homines sententiarum diversitas sit. Non dico de mysterio trinitatis, cujus recta confessio est ignoratio scientiae: sed de aliis ecclesiasticis dogmatibus, de resurrectione scilicet, et de animarum et humanae

A thorough distinction between the two schools was established by the circumstance that the Syrian school acknowledged Holy Scripture alone as the source of doctrine,[38] while the disciples of Origen advocated their Gnostic tradition as a second source.[39] But they did not attain to a scientific examination of these two positions, since all scientific free movement in the province of theology was soon checked from another quarter. In the same degree as monachism prevailed, there spread also a prejudice against having anything to do with worldly science and heathen writers.[40] By this means there was formed and strengthened a

carnis statu, de repromissionibus futurorum, quomodo debeant accipi, et qua ratione intelligenda sit Apocalypsis Johannis, quam si juxta literam accipimus, judaizandum est; si spiritualiter, ut scripta est, disserimus, multorum veterum videbimur opinionibus contraire, Latinorum Tertulliani, Victorini, Lactantii, Graecorum, ut caeteros praetermittam, Irenaei tantum Lugdunensis Episcopi faciam mentionem. Adversum quem vir eloquentissimus Dionysius Alexandrinae Ecclesiae Pontifex elegantem scribit librum, irridens mille annorum fabulam.—Cui duobus voluminibus respondit Apollinarius, quem non solum suae sectae homines, sed et nostrorum in hac parte duntaxat plurima sequitur multitudo, ut praesaga mente jam cernam, quantorum in me rabies concitanda sit. cf. Idem lib. iv. in Jeremiam (zu Cap. 19.): quae (millennarian opinions) licet non sequamur, damnare tamen non possumus, quia multi ecclesiasticorum virorum et martyrum ista dixerunt. Unusquisque in suo sensu abundet, et Domini cuncta reserventur judicio.

[38] Cyrilli Hieros. cat. iv. c. 17: Δεῖ γὰρ περὶ τῶν θείων καὶ ἁγίων τῆς πίστεως μυστηρίων μηδὲ τὸ τυχὸν ἄνευ τῶν θείων παραδίδοσθαι γραφῶν, καὶ μὴ ἁπλῶς πιθανότησι καὶ λόγων κατασκευαῖς παραφέρεσθαι. Μηδὲ ἐμοὶ τῷ ταῦτά σοι λέγοντι ἁπλῶς πιστεύσῃς, ἐὰν τὴν ἀπόδειξιν τῶν καταγγελλομένων ἀπὸ τῶν θειῶν μὴ λάβῃς γραφῶν. So in many places of his catecheses. See Touttée diss. ii. prefixed to his edition of Cyril p. 129 s. In like manner, it is said in the work de fide (see above note 18) lib. i. (Sirmondi opp. i. 11.), which probably belongs to Eusebius Emesenus: Confitere ea, quae de Patre et Filio scripta sunt, et noli curiosius ea, quae non sunt scripta, requirere.—Utinam solis scripturis contenti essemus! et lis nulla haebat. lib. ii. p. 20: Si quid scriptum non est, ne quidem dicatur: si quid autem scriptum est, ne deleatur.

[39] Comp. Div. I. § 63. note 4. Basilius de Spir. S. c. 27: τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ πεφυλαγμένων δογμάτων καὶ κηρυγμάτων τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῆς ἐγγράφου διδασκαλίας ἔχομεν, τὰ δὲ ἐκ τῆς τῶν Ἀποστόλων παραδόσεως διαδεξάμενα ἡμῖν ἐν μυστηρίῳ παρεδεξάμεθα, ἅπερ ἀμφότερα τὴν αὐτὴν ἰσχὺν ἔχει πρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν. Thus also Gregory of Nazianzum orat. theol. v. § 1 (see § 83. note 27) might assume that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit had now come over from the obscurity of gnostic tradition into faith. (πιστις.)

[40] As it is expressed in the dream of Jerome, viz. that he was punished with stripes before the most high judge, because he had read Cicero too often (Hier. epist. 22. ad Eustochium). Comp. Münscher's Dogmengesch. iii. 17.

crowd of *traditional* theologians, who, inimical to all free inquiry, would endure no opinion which could not be pointed out in the fathers. *Epiphanius*, bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, from the year 367, (†403),[41] may be regarded as the representative of this tendency. Even in his Panarion (haer. 63 and 64), he made himself known as a bitter enemy of Origen; and when the *Arian* controversy was at an end, he began an open war against Origenism. While this contest put a stop to all free inquiry in the east, the western world was contemporaneously bound in spiritual fetters by Augustine; and free science everywhere banished from the church as a thing which causes mischief.

II. PERIOD OF THE ORIGENISTIC AND PELAGIAN CONTROVERSIES.

§ 85.

ORIGENISTIC CONTROVERSIES.

Walch's Hist. d. Ketzereien. Th. 7. S. 427 ff.

Shortly after the termination of the Arian controversies, Palestine was the chief seat of Origen's followers. Among them the most distinguished were *John*, bishop of Jerusalem (386—417), and the two monks, *Rufinus* and *Jerome*. Here Epiphanius made his appearance in the year 394, and demanded with zeal the condemnation of Origen. John and Rufinus resisted him: while Jerome, who was anxiously alive to his orthodoxy, yielded, and broke off communion with the church of Jerusalem.[1] By

[41] His writings: Ἀγκυρωτός s. de fide sermo. Πανάριον s. adv. haereses. —Opp. ed. D. Petavius. Paris. 1622. (Colon. 1682.) 2 voll. fol.

[1] cf. Kimmel de Rufino Eusebii interprete (Gerae 1838.) p. 57. Hieronymi lib. ad Pammachium contra Joann. Hieros. (ap. Martianay epist. 38). Here the following erroneous doctrines are attributed to Origen (comp. Div. I. § 64. not. 15.): 1. In libro περὶ ἀρχῶν (i. 1. § 8.) loquitur: Sicut enim incongruum est dicere, quod possit filius videre patrem, ita inconveniens est opinari, quod spiritus s. possit videre filium, 2. quod in hoc corpore quasi in carcere sunt animae religatae, et, antequam homo fieret in paradiso, inter rationales creaturas in coelestibus commoratae sunt, 3. quod dicat, et diabolum et daemones acturos poenitentiam aliquando, et cum sanctis ultimo tempore regnaturos, 4. quod tunicas pelliceas humana corpora interpretetur, quibus post offensam et ejectionem de

the efforts of *Theophilus*, bishop of Alexandria, he was indeed induced to renew it 397. In the mean time, in the same year, Rufinus went back to Rome, and endeavoured, by a revised translation of the writings of Origen,[2] which were as yet little known, to procure a more favourable opinion of him in the west. By this means a violent controversy was created between him and Jerome.[3] Origen however having been condemned in Egypt, *Anastasius*, bishop of Rome, condemned him also. Rufinus retreated to Aquileia, and continued to earn the gratitude of the public by translating Greek works († 410).[4] *Jerome* on the other hand gained for himself great merit by his continued labours on the translation of the Bible into Latin, and his commentaries († 420).[5]

paradiso Adam et Eva induti sunt, 5. quod carnis resurrectionem, membrorumque compagem, et sexum, quo viri dividimur a foeminis, apertissime neget, 6. quod sic Paradisum allegorizet, ut historiae auferat veritatem, pro arboribus angelos, pro fluminibus virtutes coelestes intelligens, totamque paradisi continentiam tropologica interpretatione subvertat, 7. quod aquas, quae super caelos in scripturis esse dicuntur, sanctus supernasque virtutes; quae super terram et infra terram, contrarias et daemoniacas esse arbitretur, 8. quod imaginem et similitudinem dei, ad quam homo conditus fuerat, dicit ab eo perditam, et in homine post paradisum non fuisse.

[2] Anastasii i. epist. ad Joh. Hierosol. A.D. 401 (ap. Coustant. p. 719): Origenes autem, cujus in nostram linguam [Rufinus] composita derivavit, antea et quis fuerit, et in quae processerit verba, nostrum propositum [studium?] nescit. Augustini ep. ad. Hieron. 40: Illud de prudentia doctrinaque tua desiderabam, et adhuc desidero, ut nota nobis facias ea ipsa ejus [Origenis] errata, quibus a fide veritatis ille vir tantus recessisse convincitur.

[3] Rufini praefatio ad Orig. περὶ ἀρχῶν.—(Pammachii et Oceani ep. ad Hieron. ap. Martianay ep. 40, ap. Vallarsi ep. 83). Hieronymus ad Pammachium et Oceanum de erroribus Origenis (Martian. ep. 41, Vallarsi ep. 84.)—Rufini apologia s. invectivarum in Hieronym. libb. ii.—Hieronymi apologia adv. Rufinum libb. ii.—(Rufini ep. ad Hieron. lost). —Hieronymi responsio s. apologiae l. iii. cf. Kimmel de Rufino p. 64.

[4] Origenis libb. περὶ ἀρχῶν et homiliae, Pamphili apol. pro Origene, Josephi opp.—Eusebii hist. eccl.—Clementis recognitiones.—Basilii M. et Gregor. Naz. opp. nonnulla.—Vitae Patrum. Besides Expositio symboli apostolici, hist. eccl. libb. ii. comm. in Hoseam, Joel cact.—comp. Jo. Franc. B. Mar. de Rubeis monumenta eccl. Aquilejensis. Argentinae 1740, fol. p. 80 ss. Idem de Turannio s. Tyrannio Rufino. Venetiis 1754.

[5] Revision of the Latin translation of the New Testament (cf. epistola ad Damasum s. Hieron. in Evangelistas ad Damasum praef.).—Psalterium Romanum (382).—Psalterium Gallicanum:—New translation of the Old Testament (385—405).—Comm. in Ecclesiasten, Prophetas, in Evang.

Soon after these controversies in Palestine, the ambitious and violent *Theophilus*, bishop of Alexandria (385—412) came forth as the enemy of Origen.[6] The monks of his diocese were divided into two parties, the *Origenists* and the *Anthropomorphists*. Moved by personal hatred to some individuals of the first, and afraid of the fanaticism of the latter, Theophilus caused Origen to be condemned (399, 400),[7] then demanded the most noted bishops to do the same, and persecuted,[8] with the greatest cruelties, the monks who had adopted the heretical views of Origen.

Matthaei, in ep. ad Galatas, Ephesios, ad Titum, ad Philemonen.—Catalogus script. eccles. A.D. 392. (in J. A. Fabricii biblioth. eccles. Hamb. 1718. fol.) Interpretatio nominum Hebraicorum (388).—Polemic works: adv. Helvidium, Jovinianum, Vigilantium, Luciferianos, Pelagianos caet. —Letters, translations: Euseb. de situ et nominibus locorum Hebr. (gr. et lat. ed J. Clericus. Amst. 1707. fol.), Chronicon. Origenis homil. ii. in Cant. Cant.—Letters of Theophilus and Epiphanius. Opp. ed. Jo. Martianay. Paris. 1693—1706. T. 5. fol. Dom. Vallarsi. Veron. 1734—42. voll. xi. fol. with single improvements Venetiis 1762—72. T. xi. 4. —Jerome's Life by John Stilting. (Act. SS. Sept. T. viii. p. 413 ss.), best of all by Vallarsi in tom. xi. of his edition. Comp. v. Cölln in Ersch and Gruber's Encyclop. Sect. ii. Th. 8. S. 72.

[6] Sources for the following history: Palladii Episc. Helenopolit. dial. de vita S. Joh. Chrysostomi (prim. graece ed. Emer. Bigot. Paris. 1680. 4. in Chrysost. opp. ed Montfaucon. T. 13). Socrates vi. 3—18. Sozomenus viii. 7—20.—Joh. Stilting de S. Chrysostomo comm. historicus in Act. SS. Sept. T. iv. p. 401 ss. Neander's Chrysostomus ii. 163.

[7] Theophilus, according to Palladius ap. Monfaucon xiii. 20, had the distinguishing surname Ἀμφαλλάξ.

[8] Theophili epist. synodalis (rather encyclica) ex vers. Hieronymi first edited from an Ambrose MS. by Vallarsi (Hier. opp. vol. i. epist. 92. Mansi Conc. coll. T. iii. p. 979.). The judgment of Postumianus ap. Sulpic. Sever. dial. i. c. 6. 7. is more moderate.—The disgustful triumphing of Jerome ep. ad Theophilum (Martianay ep. 57. Vallarsi ep. 86.): Breviter scribimus, quod totus mundus exultet, et in tuis victoriis glorietur, erectumque Alexandriae vexillum crucis, et adversus haeresin trophaea fulgentia gaudens populorum turba perspectet. Macte virtute, macte zelo fidei! Ostendisti, quod hucusque taciturnitas dispensatio fuit, non consensus. Libere enim Reverentiae tuae loquor. Dolebamus te nimium esse patientem, et ignorantes magistri gubernacula, gestiebamus in interitum perditorum: sed, ut video, exaltasti manum diu, et suspendisti plagam, ut ferires fortius. Jerome translated into Latin all the writings that appeared against the Origenists (in particular Theophili libri paschales iii. with a new catalogue of Origen's heresies). These translations, with the correspondence between Jerome and Theophilus, are most fully given in Vallarsi vol. i. ep. 86 ss. How little Theophilus acted on this occasion according to his conviction is proved even by his subsequent conduct to Synesius. See § 84. not. 33.

These unfortunate persons repaired at last to Constantinople, where *John Chrysostom* of Antioch had been bishop contrary to the wishes of Theophilus[9] since 398, as much beloved by the better part of his clergy as he was hated by the more corrupt, by the luxurious court, and the empress *Eudoxia*. Theophilus directed his deadly hatred against Chrysostom, because the latter received the banished, and made representations to Theophilus on their behalf, and because by their complaints they procured from the emperor a summons commanding the bishop of Alexandria to appear in person at Constantinople before Chrysostom. After some delay, Theophilus appeared in Constantinople (403), and there succeeded in uniting the foes of Chrysostom, in procuring false accusers, and causing sentence of deposition and exile to be pronounced upon him at a synod (syn. ad. Quercum).[10] It is true Chrysostom had to be recalled in a few days on account of an uproar among the people, but he was as quickly displaced, chiefly through the influence of Eudoxia,[11] and died in exile at Pontus († 407).[12] Though the Romish bishop Innocent greatly condemned these acts of violence, he could not succeed in bringing Theophilus to account.[13] In consequence of such conduct, Rome broke off all church communion with Constantinople; and in the latter city itself, a great part of the church remained faithful to Chrysostom (Johannites), and kept themselves apart from his successors whom they looked upon as intruders, until the wrong that had been done to him was atoned by the solemn bringing back of his bones (438).

[9] Socrates vi. 2. Palladius p. 18.

[10] An extract from the Acts of this Synod is given in Photii bibl. cod. 59.

[11] Beginning of a sermon of Chrysostom (according to Socrat. vi. 18. Sozom. viii. 20.): Πάλιν Ἡρωδιὰς μαίνεται, πάλιν ταράσσεται, πάλιν ὀρχεῖται, πάλιν ἐπὶ πίνακι τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου ζητεῖ λαβεῖν.

[12] Chrysostom's own account of the events in Constantinople ep. ad Innocentium I. A.D. 404 ap. Palladius ep. ad eundem, from exile A.D. 407 (both in Constant. Innoc. P. epist. 4 et 11). Isidore, abbot in Pelusium, passed a judgment on these proceedings soon after Chrysostom's death (lib. i. epist. 152): Ἡ γείτων Αἴγυπτος συνήθως ἠνόμησε, Μωσέα παραιτουμένη, τὸν Φαραὼ οἰκειουμένη.—Τὸν λιθομανῆ καὶ χρυσολάτρην προβαλλομένη Θεόφιλον, τέσσαρσι συνεργοῖς, ἢ μᾶλλον συναποστάταις ὀχυρωθέντα, τὸν Θεοφιλῆ καὶ Θεολόγον κατεπολέμησεν ἄνθρωπον.—Ἀλλ' οἶκος Δαβὶδ κραταιοῦται, ἀσθενεῖ δὲ ὁ τοῦ Σαούλ.

[13] His epistles and those of Honorius are in Mansi Conc. coll. iii. 1095.

§ 86.

CONTROVERSIES WITH HERETICS IN THE WEST.

During the Arian disturbances, the *Manichaeans* had been *silently* spreading in the west, because for the most part they conformed externally to the catholic church. In Spain, they coincided with the Gnostics,[1] and from contact with them arose the doctrine with which *Priscillian* about 379 came forth in Spain.[2] His most violent opponents, the bishops *Idacius* and *Ithacius*, first obtained the condemnation of his doctrines at the synod of *Caesaraugusta* (330); and next they prevailed on the

[1] Jerome often alludes to the spreading of Basilides's followers into Spain (comm. in Esaiam lib. xvii. ad Es. lxiv. 4, Ep. 120. ad Hedibiam: Basilidis haeresin et Iberas naenias. Prolog. in Genesin: Iberae naeniae. Comm. in Amos. c. 3: Iberae ineptiae), and in ep. 53 ad Theodoram derives the doctrine of Priscillian from him. With him agrees Sulpic. Severus ii. 46, representing Priscillian's doctrine as derived from Egypt (infamis illa Gnosticorum haeresis), as first brought to Spain by one Marcus, a native of Memphis, communicated by him to Agape and Helpidius, and as having come through them to Priscillian. It is not denied hereby that a new development of doctrine originated with Priscillian, and it is expressly acknowledged by others that Manichaeism had an influence upon it. The emperor Maximus, in ep. ad Siricium ap. Baronius 387, no. 66, calls the Priscillianists nothing more nor less than Manichaeans; Hieronymus ep. 43, ad Ctesiphontem calls Priscillian partem Manachaei; Augustinus ep. 36 ad Casulan. says that the Priscillianists were very like the Manichaeans, and de haeres. c. 70: maxime Gnosticorum et Manichaeorum dogmata permixta sectantur. There were many, however, who were inclined to perceive orthodox doctrine under a strange garb. Hieronymus catal. c. 121: Priscillianus a nonnullis gnosticae, i.e. Basilidis et Marcionis haereseos accusator, defendentibus aliis, non ita eum sensisse ut arguitur.

[2] His history Sulpic. Sever. hist. sacr. ii. 46—51, who calls the Priscillianists Gnosticorum haeresis. Something of their doctrine, but unsatisfactory, is found in P. Orosii consultatio s. commonitorium ad Augustinum de errore Priscillianistarum et Origenistarum, and in Leonis M. epist. 93 ad Turibium Episc. Asturic—. Priscilliani canones (doctrinal consequences) ad S. Pauli epistt. cum prologo, published in the Spicilegium Romanum T. ix. (Romae 1843) P. ii. p. 1, have been altered by a bishop called Peregrinus juxta sensum fidei catholicae, and accordingly are no longer a source whence we may derive a knowledge of Priscillian's doctrine. Walch's Ketzerhist. iii. 378. Neander ii. iii. 1477. Dr J. H. B. Lübkert de haeresi Priscillianistarum. Havniae 1840. 8.

usurper *Maximus* to put him to death at Trier (385). The *Priscillianists* however continued to exist in spite of all persecutions till the sixth century.

At the same time the persecution of the *Manichaeans*, who were especially hated for various reasons, was also renewed. *Valentinian I.* who tolerated all other sects, forbade them to assemble in public for their worship in 372; and succeeding emperors enacted new and still more rigorous laws against them.[3] But their most zealous adversary was *Aurelius Augustinus*, born at Tagaste, in Numidia, who had himself belonged to the Manichaeans for a considerable time, but had been converted at Milan by Ambrose (387). Afterwards, as bishop of *Hippo Regius* in Numidia (from 395 to 430), he became a very formidable opponent of heretics, while he exercised an incalculable influence on his own and subsequent times by his doctrinal and polemical writings.[4] His energies were directed in a high degree against

[3] Lex Valentiniani i. A.D. 372 (Cod. Theod. xvi. 5, 3): Ubicunque Manichaeorum conventus, vel turba hujusmodi reperitur, Doctoribus gravi censione multatis, domus et habitacula, in quibus profana institutione docetur, fisci viribus indubitanter adsciscantur. Theodosii M. A.D. 381 (eod. tit. l. 7): Manichaeis, sub perpetua justae infamiae nota, testandi ac vivendi jure Romano omnem protinus eripimus facultatem, neque eos aut relinquendae aut capiendae alicujus haereditatis habere sinimus potestatem etc. L. 9, A.D. 382: Caeterum quos Encratitas prodigiali appellatione cognominant, cum Saccoforis sive Hydroparastatis (namely the electi of the Manichaeans)—summo supplicio et inexpiabili poena jubemus affligi. L. 18, A.D. 389: ex omni quidem orbe terrarum, sed quam maxime de hac urbe pellantur sub interminatione judicii. Honorii L. 35 A.D. 399. L. 40, A.D. 407: volumus esse publicum crimen, quia, quod in religionem divinam committitur, in omnium fertur injuriam. Quos honorum etiam publicatione persequimur, quae tamen cedere jubemus proximis quibusque personis etc. L. 43, A.D. 408, Theodosii ii. L. 59 and xvi. x. 24, both A.D. 423. xvi. v. 62, 64, 65.

[4] Besides the numerous writings against heretics, biblical commentaries (cf. Clausen Aurel. Augustinus sacrae scripturae interpres. Hafn. 1827. 8.), [Davidson's Hermeneutics, p. 133], sermons (Paniel's Gesch. d. christl. Beredsamkeit i. 781), ascetic writings, letters, the following are to be especially noted: De civitate Dei libb. xxii. (comp. § 79, note 18). De doctrina christiana libb. iv. (ed. J. Chr. B. Teegius. Lips. 1769. 8. C. H. Bruder. Ed. stereot. Lips. 1839. Paniel i. 684). Confessiones libb. xiii. (c. praef. A. Neander. Berol. 1823. 8.) Retractationes libb. ii. Opp. ed. Monachi Benedictini e Congreg. St Mauri. Paris 1679—1700. xi. voll. recus. cum appendice cura Jo. Clerici. Antwerp 1700—1703. xii. voll. Venetiis 1729—35. xi. voll. fol. Operum supplem. i. cura D. A. B. Caillau et D. B. Saint-Yves. Paris 1836. fol. Opp. emend. et aucta. Paris 1836 ss. xi voll. 8. The more all parties

the Manichaeans.[5] Many were converted by him, but many still remained in Africa. Even in Rome there were secret Manichaeans at that time; but their numbers were very much increased there after the conquest of Africa by the Vandals (429). Hence *Leo the Great* bishop of Rome (440—461), exerted himself to the utmost to detect and convert them.[6] His zeal,

had occasion to appeal to the writings of Augustine, in consequence of the high authority in which they stood, the greater was the danger of their undergoing intentional and unintentional corruptions. Even so early as the ninth century Hincmar (about 860), de non trina deitate (Opp. i. 450), unjustly accuses others of what he is disposed to do himself, i.e. of corrupting them. The doctrinal position of the editor had its influence also on the earlier editions. It is even proclaimed in the title of the Opp. Venet. 1584: in quo curavimus removeri ea omnia, quae fidelium mentes haeretica pravitate possent inficere. The Benedictines were the first who proceeded critically in their edition, but by this they gave offence to the Jesuits, who asserted they had falsified the Codd. Corbejenses. On the other side wrote Mabillon supplementum libri de re diplomatica c. 13. On this came forth the Jesuit Barth. Germon de veterum regum Franc. diplomat. discept. ii. p. 314. (App.) Now, too, the Benedictine Pet. Coustant vindiciae Codd. MSS. Paris 1707. On the contrary side B. Germon de vett. haereticis ecclesiasticorum Codd. corruptoribus. Paris 1713. 8. And again P. Coustant vindiciae vett. Codd. confirmatae. Paris 1715. 8. The life of Augustine by his disciple Possidius, completed in Caillau et Saint-Yves suppl. i. On his life and character see Wiggers Darstellung des Augustinismus u. Pelagianismus (Berlin 1821) S. 7 [translated by Emerson. Andover 1840. 8vo.] Ritter's Gesch. d. christl. Philosophie ii. 153. E. Bindemann's der h. Augustinus. Bd. 1. Berlin 1844.

[5] His writings against the Manichaeans, see Div. i. before § 61.

[6] Leonis opp. omnia (sermones et epistolae) ed. Paschas. Quesnell. Paris 1675. 2 voll. 4. Petr. et Hier. fratres Ballerinii. Venetiis 1755—57. 3 T. fol. Against the Manichaeans sermo iv. de Quadragesima: Among other things he writes, Nemo ambigat esse Manichaeos, qui in honorem solis ac lunae die Dominico et secunda feria deprehensi fuerint jejunare—Cumque ad tegendum infidelitatem suam nostris audeant interesse mysteriis, ita in sacramentorum communione se temperant, ut interdum tutius lateant: ore indigno Christi corpus accipiunt, sanguinem autem redemtionis nostrae haurire omnino declinant. Quod ideo Vestram volumus scire Sanctitatem, ut vobis hujuscemodi homines et his manifestentur indiciis, et quorum deprehensa fuerit sacrilega simulatio, notati et proditi a sanctorum societate sacerdotali auctoritate pellantur. Sermo iv. de Epiphania, after enumerating the most striking of the Manichean doctrines: Nihil ergo cum hujusmodi hominibus commune sit cuiquam Christiano, neminem fallant discretionibus ciborum, sordibus vestium, vultumque palloribus (cf. Hieron. epist. 22, ad Eustochium: quam viderint pallentem atque tristem, miseram et Manichaeam vocant). Sermo v. de jejunio decimi mensis: Residentibus itaque mecum Episco-

supported by imperial ordinances, was not ineffectual;[7] but yet single Manichaean opinions continued to exist till far into the middle ages.

There were still more furious controversies in Africa in the fourth century against *the Donatists*,[8] among whom the fanatical *Agonistici*, called by the catholic Christians *Circumcelliones*, appeared, for the purpose of rendering their cause victorious by external force.[9] The most formidable opponent of the Dona-

pis ac Presbyteris ac in eundem consessum Christianis viris ac nobilibus congregatis, Electos et Electas eorum jussimus praesentari. Qui cum de perversitate dogmatis sui, et de festivitatum suarum consuetudine multa reserarent, illud quoque scelus, quod eloqui verecundum est, prodiderunt. Quod tanta diligentia investigatum est, ut nihil minus credulis, nihil obtrectoribus relinqueretur ambiguum. Aderant enim omnes personae, per quas infandum facinus fuerat perpetratum, puella scilicet, ut multum decennis, et duae mulieres, quae ipsam nutrierant et huic sceleri praepararant. Praesto erat etiam adolescentulus vitiator puellae, et Episcopus ipsorum detestandi criminis ordinator. Omnium par fuit horum et una confessio, et patefactum est execratum, quod aures nostrae vix ferre potuerunt. De quo ne apertius loquentes castos offendamus auditus gestorum documenta sufficiunt, quibus plenissime docetur, nullam in hoc secta pudicitiam, nullam honestatem, nullam penitus reperiri castitatem, in qua lex est mendacium, diabolus religio, sacrificium turpitudo. Cf. Leonis epist. viii. ad Episcopos per Italiam. Epist. xv. ad Turibium. Papst Leo's Leben u. Lehren v. Ed. Perthel. Jena 1843. S. 15. Valentiniani iii. Novell. tit. xvii. ed. Haenel v. T. 445.

[8] Sources and works see Div. i. § 72, note 25.

[9] Concerning the time of their origin see Optatus iii. c. 4: Veniebant Paulus et Macarius (sent by the emperor about 348), qui pauperes ubique dispungerent, et ad unitatem singulos hortarentur: et cum ad Bagajensem civitatem proximarent, tunc alter Donatus—ejusdem civitatis Episcopus, impedimentum unitati et obicem venientibus supra memoratis opponere cupiens, praecones per vicina loca et per omnes nundinas misit, Circumcelliones Agonisticos nuncupans, ad praedictum locum ut concurrerent, invitavit: et eorum illo tempore concursus est flagitatus, quorum dementia paullo ante ab ipsis Episcopis impie videbatur esse succensa. Described by Augustini de haeres. lib. c. 69: Ad hanc (Donatistarum) haeresim in Africa et illi pertinent, qui appellantur Circumcelliones, genus hominum agreste et famosissimae audaciae, non solum in alios immania facinora perpetrando, sed nec sibi eadem insana feritate parcendo. Nam per mortes varias, maximeque praecipitiorum et aquarum et ignium, se ipsos necare consuerunt, et in istum furorem alios quos potuerint sexus utriusque seducere, aliquando, ut occidantur ab aliis, mortem nisi fecerint comminantes. Verumtamen plerisque Donatistarum (non) displicent tales, nec eorum communione contaminari se putant. Idem contra Crescon. iii. § 46: quotidie vestrorum incredibilia patimur facta Clericorum et Circumcellionum, multo pejora quam quorumlibet latronum atque praedonum. Namque hor-

tists was *Augustine*,[10] who at last effected, by the emperor's interference, a conference with them in *Carthage* (411), at which they were completely vanquished in the judgment of the imperial commissioner.[11] This victory, and the imperial ordinances[12] that followed, very much weakened the party, though remnants of it are found as late as the seventh century.

rendis armati cujusque generis telis, terribiliter vagando, non dico ecclesiasticam, sed ipsam humanam quietem pacemque perturbant, nocturnis agressionibus clericorum catholicorum invasas domos nudas atque inanes derelinquunt: ipsos etiam raptos et fustibus tunsos, ferroque concisos, semivivos abjiciunt. Insuper—oculis eorum calcem aceto permixto infundentes—excruciare amplius eligunt quam citius excaecare. § 47: Circumcelliorum vestrorum nobilis furor horrendum praebens vestris clericis satellitium usquequaque odiosissime innotuit. Idem contra Gaudentium i. § 32: cum idololatriae licentia usquequaque ferveret—isti Paganorum armis festa sua frequentantibus irruebant (cf. epist. 185, § 12: quando adhuc cultus fuerat idolorum, ad Paganorum celeberrimas sollemnitates ingentia turbarum agmina veniebant, non ut idola frangerent, sed ut interficerentur a cultoribus idolorum: doubtless in the time from Julian to Gratian)—.Praeter haec sunt saxa immania et montium horrida praerupta, voluntariorum creberrimis mortibus nobilitata vestrorum: aquis et ignibus rarius id agebant, praecipitiis greges consumebantur ingentes. Quis enim nescit hoc genus hominum in horrendis facinoribus inquietum, ab utilibus operibus otiosum, crudelissimum in mortibus alienis, vilissimum in suis, maxime in agris territans, ab agris vacans, et victus sui causa cellas circumiens rusticanas, unde et Circumcellionum nomen accepit? Ejusd. enarratio in Psalm. 132, § 3: Quando vos recte haereticis de Circumcellionibus insultare coeperitis—illi vobis insultant de Monachis. Primo si comparandi sunt, vos videte. Comparentur ebriosi cum sobriis, praecipites cum consideratis, furentes cum simplicibus, vagantes cum congregatis. § 6: Fortasse dicturi sunt: nostri non vocantur Circumcelliones: vos illos ita appellatis contumelioso nomine. Agonisticos eos vocant. Sic eos, inquiunt appellamus propter agonem. Certant enim, et dicit Apostolus: certamen bonum certavi (2 Tim. iv. 7). Quia sunt qui certant adversus diabolum et praevalent milites Christi, Agonistici appellantur. Utinam ergo milites Christi essent, et non milites diaboli, a quibus plus timetur Deo laudes, quam fremitus leonis. Hi etiam insultare nobis audent, quia fratres, cum vident homines, Deo gratias dicunt. Vos *Deo gratias* nostrum ridetis: *Deo laudes* vestrum plorant homines (cf. contra literas Petiliani ii. § 146: considerate paululum, quam multis, et quantum luctum dederint *Deo laudes* armatorum vestrorum).

[10] Adr. Roux diss. de Aur. Augustino adversario Donatistarum. Lugd. Bat. 1838. 8.

[11] Gesta collationis Carthagine habitae prim. ed. Papirius Masson. Paris 1589. 8., according to the corrected edition of Baluzius in du Pin monim. ad hist. Donatist. p. 225, and Mansi Concil. coll. T. iv. p. 1. Augustini breviculus collationis cum Donatistis (opp. T. ix. p. 371).

[12] After several other laws against them, Cod. Theod. xvi. 5, 52,

§ 87.

PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY.

G. J. Vossii hist. de controversiis, quas Pelagius ejusque reliquiae moverunt libb. VII. Lugd. Bat. 1618. 4. auct. ed. G. Voss. Amst. 1655. 4. (in Vossii opp. T. VI). Henr. Norisii hist. Pelagiana et dissert. de Synodo V. oecumenica. Patavii 1673. fol. (in Norisii Opp. T. I. Veron. 1729). Joh. Garnier diss. VII., quibus integra continetur Pelagianorum hist. (in his edition of Marii. Mercatoris Opp. I, 113), Praefatio in Tom. X. Opp. Augustini edit. Monach. Benedict. Walch's Ketzerhistorie IV. 519. Wundemann's Gesch. d. christl. Glaubenslehren, II., 44. Münscher's Dogmengesch. IV., 170. G. F. Wiggers Pragmat. Darstellung. des Augustinismus u. Pelagianismus. 2 Theile. Berlin 1821. 33. 8. Neander's Kirchengesch. II. III., 1194. Ritter's Gesch. d. crhistl. Philos. II. 337.

Augustine exerted the greatest influence on the doctrines especially of the occidental church, by his system of the relation of Divine grace to the human will, which he developed in the Pelagian controversy. The freedom of the will, the evil consequences of the fall, and the necessity of Divine grace, had always been admitted in the church without any attempt having been made to define by ecclesiastical formulas the undefinable in these doctrines.[1] Since Tertullian, an opinion had been peculiar to the Latin fathers which was wholly unknown to the Greek church, that the sin of Adam had been transferred as a peccable principle to his posterity, by generation (tradux animae, tradux pec-

Honorius ordered a general fine to be exacted of them. Also: Servos etiam dominorum admonitio, vel colonos verberum crebrior ictus a prava religione revocabit—.Clerici vero ministrique eorum ac perniciosissimi sacerdotales ablati de Africano solo, quod ritu sacrilego polluerunt, in exilium. viritim ad singulas quasque regiones sub idonea prosecutione mittantur, ecclesiis eorum vel conventiculis praediisque, si qua in eorum ecclesias haereticorum largitas prava contulit, proprietati potestatique Catholicae (sicut jam dudum statuimus) vindicatis. In addition to all this, 414 L. 54: Evidenti praeceptione se agnoscant et intestabiles, et nullam potestatem alicujus ineundi habere contractus, sed perpetua inustos infamia, a coetibus honestis et a conventu publico segregandos.

[1] Horn comm. de sententiis eorum Patrum, quorum auctoritas ante Augustinum plurimum valuit, de peccato originali. Goetting. 1801. 4. Wiggers i. 403 ff. How groundlessly Augustine appealed in support of his theory to Gregory of Nazianzum is shown by Ullmann in his work Gregor. v. Naz. S. 438 ff. 446 ff.

cati). This must necessarily have had some influence on the doctrines of free will and Divine grace.[2] *Pelagius* and *Caelestius*, two monks universally esteemed for their virtues, had distinguished themselves even during their abode at *Rome* (till 409), by giving peculiar prominence to the doctrine of free will for the promotion of virtuous effort.[3] Afterwards they repaired to Africa (411), whence Pelagius soon passed over into Palestine. But Caelestius, when he became a candidate for the office of presbyter in Carthage, was accused of various errors which had proceeded from the tendency to exalt free will,[4] and was excluded from church communion by a *synod at Carthage* (412); on which he went to *Ephesus*.

The doctrines of Caelestius, however, had gained many friends, and therefore Augustine was induced to oppose them, although personally he had no share in the transactions of the synod

[2] Hilarius Pictav. in Matth. c. 18, § 6: In unius Adae errore omne hominum genus aberravit. Ambrosius expos. Evang. Lucae l. vii. p. 434: Fuit Adam, et in illo fuimus omnes. Periit Adam, et in illo omnes perierunt. L. vii. § 27: Deos quos dignat vocat, quos vult religiosos facit. Comp. Neander ii. iii. 1188.

[3] Particularly did Pelagius disapprove the address to God, in Augustini confess x. 29: Da quod jubes, et jube quod vis, see August. de dono perseverantiae c. 20.

[4] Marius Mercator has preserved from the gestis Concilii the seven points of accusation (commonitorium i. ed. Baluz. p. 3 comm. ii. p. 133): I. Adam mortalem factum, qui sive peccaret, sive non peccaret, fuisset moriturus. II. Quoniam peccatum Adae ipsum solum laesit, et non genus humanum. III. Quoniam infantes, qui nascuntur, in eo statu sunt, in quo Adam fuit ante praevaricationem. IV. Quoniam neque per mortem vel praevaricationem Adae omne genus hominum moriatur, neque per resurrectionem Christi omne hominum genus resurgat. V. Quoniam infantes, etiamsi non baptizentur, habeant vitam aeternam. VI. Quoniam lex sic mittit ad regnum coelorum, quomodo et evangelium. VII. Quoniam et ante adventum Domini fuerunt homines impeccabiles, id est sine peccato (p. 3: Posse esse hominem sine peccato et facile Dei mandata servare, quia et ante Christi adventum fuerunt homines sine peccato). Cf. Augustin. de gestis Pelagii 11. Caelestius's defence of the second and third points in Augustin. de pecc. orig. c. 3, 4 (from the Synodical acts): Dixi, de traduce peccati dubium me esse, ita tamen, ut cui donavit Deus gratiam peritiae, consentiam; quia diversa ab eis audivi, qui utiquè in ecclesia catholica constituti sunt presbyteri. Sanctus presbyter Rufinus (perhaps the celebrated, see Norisius hist. Pelag. i. 2, and de Syn. quint. c. 13) Romae qui mansit cum sancto Pammachio: ego audivi illum dicentem, quia tradux peccati non sit—. Licet quaestionis res sit ista, non haeresis. Infantes semper dixi egere baptizari: quid quaerit aliud?

by which Caelestius was condemned. His attention was soon drawn to the writings of Pelagius as the teacher of Caelestius, which he refuted, but always as yet with respect and forbearance.[5] But after *Jerome* in Palestine had begun to raise suspicions against Pelagius of being an Origenist,[6] for he hated him from some trifling cause; and after *Orosius*,[7] a presbyter sent by Augustine, had failed in his attempt to procure the condemnation of the Pelagian doctrine, with John, bishop of Jerusalem, and also with the *synod at Diospolis (Lydda* 415), Augustine

[5] Augustinus's controversial writings till 415: Sermones 170, 174, 175, 293, 294; epist. 140 ad Honoratum; 157 ad Hilarium (in reply to his information of Pelagians in Sicily in epist. 156); especially de peccatorum meritis et remissione (s. de baptismo parvulorum) libb. iii. ad Marcellinum (in the third book against Pelagii expositiones in Pauli epist.); and de spiritu et littera ad eundem. These writings from 412—414. De natura et gratia against Pelagii lib. de natura (ep. 169, § 13, adversus Pelagii haeresim) und de perfectione justitiae hominis epist. s. liber ad Eutropium et Paullum, against Caelestii definitiones, both in the year 415.

[6] Hieron. praef. libri i. in Jerem. Nuper indoctus calumniator erupit, qui commentarios meos in epistolam Pauli ad Ephesios reprehendendos putat (cf. Augustin. contra Julianum ii. 36: De illo sancto presbytero (Hieronymo)—non solet Pelagius jactitare, nisi quod ei tamquam aemulo inviderit). Praef. lib. iv. in Jerem.: subito haeresis Pythagorae et Zenonis ἀπαθείας καὶ ἀναμαρτησίας id est impassibilitatis et impeccantiae, quae olim in Origene, et dudum in discipulis ejus, Grunnio, Evagrioque Pontico, et Joviniano jugulata est, coepit reviviscere, et non solum in Occidentis, sed in Orientis partibus sibilare. Jerome wrote against Pelagius the epist. ad Ctesiphontem (ap. Martianay ep. 43, ap. Vallarsi ep. 133) and the dialogi contra Pelagianos libb. iii. in the years 414 and 415. Against the dialogues, although the doctrinal system in them is much nearer the Pelagian than the Augustinian, wrote Theodorus Mopsvestenus πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας, φύσει, καὶ οὐ γνώμῃ, πταίειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους libb. v., cf. Photius cod. 177 and Ebedjesu in Assemani bibl. Or. iii. i. 34. Latin fragments in Marius Mercator ed. Baluz. p. 339 ss.

[7] Augusts epist. 169 § 13: Scripsi etiam librum ad sanctum presbyterum Hieronymum de animae origine (is ep. 166), consulens eum, quomodo defendi possit illa sententia, quam religiosae memoriae Marcellino suam esse scripsit, singulas animas novas nascentibus fieri, ut non labefactetur fundatissima ecclesiae fides, qua inconcusse credimus, quod in Adam omnes moriuntur, et nisi per Christum liberentur, quod per suum Sacramentum etiam in parvulis operatur, in condemnationem trahuntur. Occasionem quippe cujusdam sanctissimi et studiosissimi juvenis presbyteri Orosii, qui ad nos ab ultima Hispania, id est ab Oceani littore, solo sanctarum scripturarum ardore inflammatus advenit, amittere nolui, cui, ut ad illum quoque pergeret, persuasi.

[8] See the narrative in Orosii apologeticus contra Pelagium de arbitrii libertate.

laid aside all forbearance, and opposed Pelagianism severely and bitterly in many works.[9] The African bishops solemnly condemned the heresy[10] at the synods of *Mileve* and *Carthage* (416), and *Innocent I.* bishop of Rome, fully agreed with them.[11] After Innocent's death († 417), Pelagius and Caelestius applied to his successor Zosimus, by whom they were declared orthodox;[12] but the Africans adhered in their decision to *the synod at Carthage* (417),[13] and *the general synod* held at the same place (418),[14] and succeeded in obtaining from *Honorius* a *sacrum rescriptum* against the Pelagians.[15] Zosimus now also yielded,

[9] In the year 416: De gestis Pelagii s. de gestis Palaestinis (at the same time the chief source respecting the Synod of Diospolis). 418: Contra Pelagium et Caelestium libb. ii. i. de gratia Christi ii. de peccato originali, a standard work. 419: De nuptiis et concupiscentia libb. ii. De anima ejusque origine. 420: Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum libb. iv. ad Bonifacium Rom. eccl. Episcopum. 421: Contra Julianum haer. Pelagianae defensorem libb. vi. 426, 427: (comp. below note 45) De gratia et libero arbitrio ad Monachos Adrumetinos. De correptione et gratia ad eosdem (in which the doctrine of predestination is most plainly brought forward). 427—430: Contra secundam Juliani responsionem imperfectum opus, libb. vi.

[10] A synodical letter to Innocent I. from Carthage in epist. Augustini ep. 175, from Mileve in ep. 176. Both also in Coustant.

[11] His reply to Carthage August. epist. 181, to Mileve ep. 182. and in Coustant.

[12] See especially Caelestii symb. ad Zosim. below not. 19. The three letters of Zosimus ad Aurelium et caeteros Episc. Afric., the first two of Sept. 417, the third of 21 March 418 may be found in Coustant. In the first it is said: Ipsum sane Caelestium, et quicunque in tempore ex diversis regionibus aderant sacerdotes, admonui, has tendiculas quaestionum et inepta certamina, quae non aedificant, sed magis destruunt, ex illa curiositatis contagione profluere, dum unusquisque ingenio suo et intemperanti eloquentia supra scripta (i.e. Scripturam S.) abutitur, &c.

[13] Fragment of the synod's letter to Zosimus in Prosperi l. contra collatorem c. 15: Constituimus, in Pelagium atque Caelestium per venerabilem episcopum Innocentium de beatissimi apostoli Petri sede prolatam manere sententiam, donec apertissima confessione fateantur, gratia Dei per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum, non solum ad cognoscendam, verum etiam ad faciendam justitiam nos per actus singulos adjuvari, &c.

[14] Mansi iv. 377. The eight (or nine see Norisius l. c. p. 135, the Benedictine preface in T. x. Opp. Aug. § 18. and App. T. x. p. 71) Canones against the Pelagians are in the collection of the decrees of councils put erroneously as the first of the synod at Mileve A.D. 416. Ap. Mansi iv. 325.

[15] See Opp. August. ed Benedict. T. x. Appendicis pars ii. continens varia scripta et monumenta ad Pelagianorum historiam pertinentium p. 105. (ed. Venet.). The Edictum of the three Praeff. Praetorio consequent thereon p. 106.

and condemned Pelagianism in the *Epistola tractoria*.[16] The Italian bishops were compelled to subscribe this; and eighteen who refused were deposed. Among them also was *Julian*, bishop of Eclanum, who continued to defend Pelagianism in various works, against which Augustine wrote several in refutation.

The Pelagians did not form an ecclesiastical but simply a theological party. They had also no common type of doctrine, and therefore deviated from one another in particular points. Their opinions,[17] which are to be found without disfigurement only in their own works,[18] may be reduced to the following arti-

[16] Fragments of it in Appendix p. 108 and ap. Coustant. That the tractoria was not issued before the African council and the sacrum rescriptum, as is supposed by Baronius, Norisius, Garnier and others, but after both, is proved by Tillemont T. xiii. p. 738, 739, and the Benedictines praef. ad T. x. opp. Aug. § 18. Hence August. contra duas epist. Pelag. ii. c. 3: Quin etiam (Pelagiani) Romanos clericos arguunt, scribentes, "eos jussionis terrore perculsos non erubuisse praevaricationis crimen admittere, ut contra priorem sententiam suam, qua gestis catholico dogmati adfuerant, postea pronuntiarent, malam hominum esse naturam:".

[17] Besides the works already referred to comp. J. G. Voigt comm. de theoria Augustiniana, Pelagiana, Semipelagiana et synergistica in doctrina de peccato originali, gratia et libero arbitrio. Gottingae 1829. 4. J. H. Lentzen de Pelagianorum doctrinae principiis diss Coloniae ad Rh. 1833. 8. Die Lehre des Pelagius v. Lic. J. L. Jacobi. Leipzig 1842. 8.

[18] Three works of Pelagius have been preserved complete by the circumstance of their having fallen among those of Jerome, viz. Pelagii expositiones in epist. Pauli before the year 410. (That Pelagius is the author is proved by G. J. Vossius hist. Pelag. i. 4. Probably Cassiodorus emended doctrinally nothing but the commentary on the ep. to the Romans. Comp. Rosenmüller hist. Interpret. iii. 505.)—Epistola ad Demetriadem A.D. 413. (cum aliis aliorum epistolis ed. J. S. Semler. Hal. 1775. 8. cf. Rosenmüller l. c. p. 522 ss.)—Libellus fidei ad Innocent. I. A.D. 417. (taken into libros Carolinos de imag. cultu iii. c. 1. as confessio fidei, quam a ss. Patribus accepimus, tenemus et puro corde credimus; as late as 1521 cited by the Sorbonne in their Articulis against Luther as sermo Augustini, often falsely called Hieronymi Symboli explan. ad Damasum; cf. Jo. Launojus de auctore vero professionis fidei, quae Pelagio, Hieronymo, Augustino tribui vulgo solet Diss. Paris. ed. 2. 1663. 8. in his Opp. ii. ii. 302. Walchii bibl. symb. vetus p. 192 ss.)—Fragments of Pelagii lib. de natura ap. August. de nat. et gratia. Of the libb. iv. de libero arbitrio and the epist. ad Innocent I. fragments ap. August. de gratia Christi and de peccato originali. Capitula s. eclogae fragments in Hieron. dial. i. contra Pelagianos and ap. August. de gestis Pelagii.—Caelestii definitiones Fragments ap. August. de perfectione justitiae hominis. Symbolum ad Zosimum fragments ap. August. de peccato

cles. "There is no original sin.[19] Man can by his free will choose good as well as evil.[20] Every one therefore can obtain happiness (salus s. vita aeterna). In Christianity a still higher happiness is presented, for which baptism is a necessary condi-

origin. (cf. Walchii bibl. symb. vetus p. 198 ss.)—Juliani libb. iv. ad Turbantium Episc. contra Augustini primum de nuptiis, fragments ap. August. contra Julianum, and in M. Mercatoris subnotationes. Libb. viii. ad 'Florum contra Augustini secundum de nuptiis, fragments in Aug. opus imperfect. and ap. Marius Mercator l. c—.A Pelagian creed falsely called by Garnier Symb. Juliani, see Walch. bibl. symb. vet. p. 199 ss.

[19] Caelestii Symb. fragm. i.: Infantes autem debere baptizari in remissionem peccatorum secundum regulam universalis ecclesiae et secundum evangelii sententiam, confitemur, quia Dominus statuit, regnum caelorum nonnisi baptizatis posse conferri: quod quia vires naturae non habent, conferri necesse est per gratiae libertatem. In remissionem autem peccatorum baptizandos infantes non idcirco diximus, ut peccatum ex traduce (or peccatum naturae, peccatum naturale) firmare videamur, quod longe a catholico sensu alienum est. Quia peccatum non cum homine nascitur, quod postmodum exercetur ab homine: quia non naturae delictum, sed voluntatis esse demonstratur. Et illud ergo confiteri congruum, ne diversa baptismatis genera facere videamur, et hoc praemunire necessarium est, ne per mysterii occasionem, ad creatoris injuriam, malum, antequam fiat ab homine, tradi dicatur homini per naturam. Pelagii ep. ad Demetr. c. 4: Ferat sententiam de naturae bono ipsa conscientia bona.—Quid illud obsecro est, quod ad omne peccatnm aut erubescimus, aut timemus? et culpam facti nunc rubore vultus, nunc pallore monstramus?—e diverso autem in omni bono laeti, constantes, intrepidi sumus? —Est enim inquam in animis nostris naturalis quaedam (ut ita dixerim) sanctitas, quae velut in arce animi praesidens exercit boni malique judicium. But comp. c. 8: Neque vero alia nobis causa difficultatem bene faciendi facit, quam longa consuetudo vitiorum, quae nos infecit a parvo, paulatimque per multos corrupit annos, et ita postea obligatos sibi et addictos tenet, ut vim quodammodo videatur habere naturae.

[20] Pelagius ap. August. de pecc. orig. 14: Omne bonum ac malum, quo vel laudabiles vel vituperabiles sumus, non nobiscum oritur, sed agitur a nobis: capaces enim utriusque rei, non pleni nascimur, et ut sine virtute, ita et sine vitio procreamur: atque ante actionem ,propriae voluntatis, id solum in homine est, quod Deus condidit. Epist. ad Demetr. c. 3: Volens namque Deus rationabilem creaturam voluntarii boni munere et liberi arbitrii potestate donare, utriusque partis possibilitatem homini inserendo proprium ejus fecit, esse quod velit: ut boni ac mali capax, naturaliter utrumque posset, et ad alterutrum voluntatem deflecteret. Hence Caelestii definitiones are proofs, hominem sine peccato esse posse. Among other things it is said def. 2: Iterum quaerendum est, peccatum voluntatis an necessitatis est? Si necessitatis est, peccatum non est, si voluntatis, vitari potest. 5. Iterum quaerendum est, utrumne debeat homo sine peccato esse. Procul dubio debet. Si debet, potest: si non potest, ergo non debet. Et si non debet homo esse sine peccato, debet ergo cum peccato esse; et jam peccatum non erit, si illud deberi constiterit.

tion (regnum coelorum).[21] As the law was formerly given to facilitate the bringing about of goodness, so now the instructions and example of Christ, and the particular operations of grace. The latter, however, always follow the free resolution to be good.[22] God's predestination therefore is founded solely on his foreknowledge of human actions."

Though Augustine had formerly in his controversy with the Manichaeans conceded much to free will, and taken a very different view of predestination,[23] he had long before Pelagius

[21] August. de pecc. merit. et remiss. i. 30: Sed quia non ait, inquiunt, "Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua at spiritu, non habebit salutem vel vitam aeternam," tantummodo autem dixit "non intrabit in regnum Dei" (Jo. iii. 5.): ad hoc parvuli baptizandi sunt, ut sint etiam cum Christo in regno Dei, ubi non erunt, si baptizati non fuerint: quamvis et sine baptismo si parvuli moriantur, salutem vitamque aeternam habituri sint, quoniam nullo peccati vinculo obstricti sunt. In like manner Origen ad Rom. ii. 7. see Div. i. § 67. not. 1.

[22] Pelagius de libero arbitrio (ap. Aug. de grat. Chr. 7.): Hic nos imperitissimi hominum putant injuriam divinae gratiae facere, quia dicimus eam sine voluntate nostra nequaquam in nobis perficere sanctitatem: quasi Deus gratiae suae aliquid imperaverit, et non illis, quibus imperavit, etiam gratiae suae auxilium subministret, ut quod per liberum homines facere jubentur arbitrium, facilius possent implere per gratiam. Quam nos non, ut tu putas, in lege tantummodo, sed et in Dei esse adjutorio confitemur. Adjuvat enim nos Deus per doctrinam et revelationem suam, dum cordis nostri oculos aperit; dum nobis, ne praesentibus occupemur, futura demonstrat; dum diaboli pandit insidias; dum nos multiformi et ineffabili dono gratiae caelestis illuminat. Ejusdem ep. ad Innoc. (ibid. c. 31.): Ecce apud beatitudinem tuam epistola ista me purget, in qua pure atque simpliciter ad peccandum et ad non peccandum integrum liberum arbitrium habere nos dicimus, quod in omnibus bonis operibus divino adjuvatur semper auxilio. Quam liberi arbitrii potestatem dicimus in omnibus esse generaliter, in Christianis, Judaeis, atque Gentilibus. In omnibus est liberum arbitrium aequaliter per naturam, sed in solis Christianis juvatur a gratia.

[23] August. de praedest. Sanct. c. 3: Quo praecipue testimonio (1 Cor. iv. 7.) etiam ipse convictus sum, cum similiter errarem, putans fidem, qua in Deum credimus, non esse donum Dei, sed a nobis esse in nobis, et per illam nos impetrare Dei dona, quibus temperanter et juste et pie vivamus in hoc saeculo. Neque enim fidem putabam Dei gratia praeveniri, ut per illam nobis daretur, quod posceremus utiliter, nisi quia credere non possemus, si non praecederet praeconium veritatis: ut autem praedicato nobis Evangelio consentiremus, nostrum esse proprium, et nobis ex nobis esse arbitrabar. Quem meum errorem nonnulla opuscula mea satis indicant ante episcopatum meum scripta (in particular the expositio quarundam propositionum in ep. ad Rom. c. 60 and 61, other works against the Manichaeans. See Wundemann ii. 79 and 91. Neander's Kirchengesch. ii. iii. 1205.) cf. Retractt. i. 23.

adopted a stricter view,[24] which was for the first time developed in the controversy with the Pelagians[25] in the following system. "By the sin of Adam human nature became physically and morally corrupt.[26] From it evil lust (concupiscentia) has come, which, while it has become the inheritance of all men by generation, has risen to original sin, in itself damnatory (peccatum originale, vitium originale, vitium haereditarium),[27] and prevails

[24] Comp. lib. de diversis quaestionibus 83. (written A.D. 388—395) Qu. lxviii. § 4—6. De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum l. i. Qu. 2. (A.D. 397). Münscher's Dogmengesch. iv. 200.

[25] See Wiggers i. 264 ff. Even Duns Scotus (Quaest. in Lombard. lib. ii. Dist. 33.) says: frequenter sancti extinguendo contra se haereses pullulantes excessive locuti sunt volentes declinare ad aliud extremum: —sicut Augustinus contra Arium videtur quasi declinare ad Sabellium et e converso, similiter videtur contra Pelagium declinare ad Arium (leg. Manichaeum) et e converso. So also Cornelius Mussus Episc. Bitontinus († 1574) comm. in epist. ad Rom. c. 5. p. 270. cf. Jo. Fabricii diss. de Scylla theologica in ejusd. amoenitatibus theoll. c. 9. On the other hand Norisius in the vindiciis Augustinianis c. 5. § 5. seeks to defend him.—The Augustinian system is very differently represented, because the most opposite parties wished to find their own sentiments in it. It is most correctly described by the Reformed, the Dominicans, Augustines, and Jansenists; most misrepresented by the Jesuits.

[26] Wiggers i. 106.

[27] Comp, especially the books de peccato originali and de nuptiis et concupiscentia.—De civ. Dei xiv. 1: A primis hominibus admissum est tam grande peccatum, ut in deterius eo natura mutaretur humana, etiam in posteros obligatione peccati et mortis necessitate transmissa. De peccat. merit. et remiss. i. 9: Ille, in quo omnes moriuntur, praeter quod eis qui praeceptum Domini voluntate transgrediuntur, imitationis exemplum est, occulta etiam tabe carnalis concupiscentiae suae tabificavit in se omnes de sua stirpe venientes. De nuptiis et concupiscentia i. 24. Ex hac carnis concupiscentia, tanquam filia peccati, et quando illi ad turpia consentitur, etiam peccatorum matre multorum, quaecunque nascitur proles, originali est obligata peccato, nisi in illo renascatur, quem sine ista concupiscentia virgo concepit: propterea, quando nasci est in carne dignatus, sine peccato solus est natus. De corrept. et gratia 10: Quia vero (Adam) per liberum arbitrium Deum deseruit, justum judicium Dei expertus est, ut cum tota sua stirpe, quae in illo adhuc posita tota cum illo peccaverat, damnaretur (de peccat. merit. et remiss. i. 10, Rom. v. 12 is cited for this purpose, in quo omnes peccaverunt, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, quando omnes ille unus homo fuerunt). Quotquot enim ex hac stirpe gratia Dei liberantur, a damnatione utique liberantur, qua jam tenentur obstricti. Unde etiam si nullus liberaretur, justum Dei judicium nemo juste reprehenderet. Quod ergo pauci in comparatione pereuntium, in suo vero numero multi liberantur, gratia fit, gratis fit, gratiae sunt agendae, quia fit, ne quis velut de suis meritis extollatur, sed omne os obstruatur, et qui gloriatur, in Domino glorietur. De pecc. orig. 31:

so much over the will of the natural man that he can no longer will what is good, as he should do, out of love to God, but sins continually, as his actions may also externally shew.[28] From this corrupt mass of humanity (perditionis massa) God resolved from eternity to save some through Christ and consign the rest to deserved perdition. Though baptism procures forgiveness of sin, even of original sin, it does not remove the moral corruption of man.[29] Therefore, Divine grace alone, and irresistibly, works

Unde ergo recte infans illa perditione punitur, nisi quia pertinet ad massam perditionis, et juste intelligitur ex Adam natus, antiqui debiti obligatione damnatus, nisi inde fuerit, non secundum debitum, sed secundum gratiam liberatus? Hence the Pelagians accused him of holding the doctrine of a tradux animae and tradux peccati (Traduciani). Inclined as he may have been to that view, he left the question of the origin of souls undecided. cf. de anima et ejus origine libb. iv. Opus imp. iv. 104: Arguo de origine animarum cunctationem meam, quia non audeo docere vel affirmare quod nescio (cf. de peccat. merit. et remiss. ii. 36).

[28] Contra duas epistt. Pelagianorum i. 2: Quis autem nostrum dicat, quod primi hominis peccato perierit liberum arbitrium de humano genere? Libertas quidem periit per peccatum, sed illa quae in paradiso fuit, habendi plenam cum immortalitate justitiam; propter quod natura humana divina indiget gratia, dicente Domino: si vos Filius liberaverit, tunc vere liberi eritis (John viii. 36.), utique liberi ad bene justeque vivendum. Nam liberum arbitrium usque adeo in peccatore non periit, ut per illud peccent, maxime omnes qui cum delectatione peccant et amore peccati: hoc eis placet, quod eis libet. De gratia Christi 26: Quid autem boni faceremus, nisi diligeremus? Aut quomodo bonum non facimus, si diligamus? Etsi enim Dei mandatum videtur aliquando non a diligentibus, sed a timentibus fieri: tamen ubi non est dilectio, nullum bonum opus imputatur, nec recte bonum opus vocatur, quia omne quod non ex fide est, peccatum est, et fides per dilectionem operatur. Ac per hoc gratiam Dei, qua caritas Dei diffunditur in cordibus nostris per Spiritum sanctum, qui datus est nobis, sic confiteatur, qui vult veraciter confiteri, ut omnino nihil boni sine illa, quod ad pietatem pertinet veramque justitiam, fieri posse non dubitet. Wiggers i. 121. J. G. L. Duncker hist. doctrinae de ratione quae inter peccatum originale et actuale intercedit apud Irenaeum, Tertullianum, Augustinum. Gottingae 1836. 8.

[29] De nupt. et concupisc. i. 26: In eis ergo qui regenerantur in Christo, cum remissionem accipiunt prorsus omnium peccatorum utique necesse est, ut reatus etiam hujus licet adhuc manentis concupiscentiae remittatur, ut in peccatum, sicut dixi, non imputetur.—manet actu, praeterit reatu. De peccat. de meritis et remiss. i. 19: Caeterum quis ignorat, quod baptizatus parvulus, si ad rationales annos veniens non crediderit, nec se ab illicitis concupiscentiis abstinuerit, nihil ei proderit, quod parvus accepit? Verumtamen si percepto baptismate de hac vita emigraverit, soluto reatu, cui originaliter erat obnoxius, perficietur in illo lumine

faith in the elect, as well as love and power to do good.[30] Those to whom the grace of God is not imparted[31] have no advantage

veritatis, quod incommutabiliter manens in aeternum, justificatos praesentia creatoris illuminat.

[30] In the beginning of the controversy Augustine still thought of these operations of grace as resistibiles, see de spiritu et litera c. 34: agit Deus, ut velimus, et ut credamus, sive extrinsecus per evangelicas exhortationes,—sive intrinsecus, ubi nemo habet in potestate quid ei veniat id mentem, sed consentire vel dissentire propriae voluntatis est. His ergo modis quando Deus agit cum anima rationali, ut ei credat (neque enim credere potest quodlibet libero arbitrio, si nulla sit suasio vel vocatio cui credat), profecto et ipsum velle credere Deus operatur in homine, et in omnibus misericordia ejus praevenit nos: consentire autem vocationi Dei, vel ab ea dissentire, sicut dixi, propriae voluntatis est. But in his later works they appear as irresistibly acting. De corrept. et grat. 7: Quicunque ergo ab illa originali damnatione ista divinae gratiae largitate discreti sunt, non est dubium, quod et procuratur eis audiendum evangelium; et cum audiunt, credunt; et in fide, quae per delectionem operatur, usque in finem perseverant; et si quando exorbitant, correpti emendantur; et quidam eorum, etsi ab hominibus non corripiantur, in viam quam reliquerant redeunt; et nonnulli accepta gratia, in qualibet aetate, periculis hujus vitae mortis celeritate subtrahuntur. Haec enim omnia operatur in eis, qui vasa misericordiae operatus est eos, qui et elegit eos in filio suo ante constitutionem mundi per electionem gratiae. De gratia Christi c. 24: Non lege atque doctrina insonante forinsecus, sed interna atque occulta mirabili ac ineffabili potestate operari Deum in cordibus hominum non solum veras revelationes, sed etiam bonas voluntates. De corrept. et grat. c. 9: Quicunque ergo in Dei providentissima dispositione praesciti, praedestinati, vocati, justificati, glorificati sunt, non dico etiam nondum renati, sed etiam nondum nati, jam filii Dei sunt, et omnino perire non possunt. Ibid. 12: Ac per hoc nec de ipsa perseverantia boni voluit Deus sanctos suos in viribus suis, sed in ipso gloriari. —Tantum quippe Spiritu sancto accenditur voluntas eorum, ut ideo possint, quia sic volunt; ideo sic velint, quia Deus operatur, ut velint.— Subventum est igitur infirmitati voluntatis humanae, ut divina gratia indeclinabiliter et insuperabiliter ageretur. Ibid. 14: Non est itaque dubitandum, voluntati Dei, qui in caelo et in terra omnia, quaecunque voluit, fecit, et qui etiam illa, quae futura sunt, fecit, humanas voluntates non posse resistere, quo minus faciat ipse quod vult: quandoquidem etiam de ipsis hominum voluntatibus, quod vult, cum vult, facit. These moral effects of grace Augustine comprehends under Justificatio, cf. opus imperfect. contra Jul. ii. c. 168: Justificat impium Deus, non solum dimittendo, quae mala facit, sed etiam donando caritatem, quae declinat a malo et facit bonum per Spiritum sanctum.

[31] For the most part Augustine uses the expression Praedestinatio only of predestination to happiness, but sometimes also of condemnation. Tract. 110. in Joan. distinguishes duplicem mundum, unum damnationi praedestinatum, alterum ex inimico amicum factum et reconciliatum. Enchirid. ad Laur. c. 100: Haec sunt magna opera Domini, ut, cum an-

from Christ, and fall into condemnation,[32] even an eternal one."[33]

gelica et humana creatura peccásset,—etiam per eandem creaturae voluntatem, qua factum est quod Creator noluit, impleret ipse quod voluit: bene utens et malis, tamquam summe bonus, ad eorum damnationem, quos juste praedestinavit ad poenam, et ad eorum salutem, quos benigne praedestinavit ad gratiam. cf. de grat. et lib. arbitr. c. 21: operari Deum in cordibus hominum ad inclinandas eorum voluntates quocunque voluerit, sive ad bona pro sua misericordia, sive ad mala pro meritis eorum. Ratramnus de praedest. ii. (in Vett. auctorum, qui ix. saec. de praedest. et gratia scripserunt opera, cura Gilb. Mauguin i. 62.) has collected several passages of this kind. Comp. however Wiggers i. 305.

[32] De peccat. merit. et remiss. iii. 4: Quoniam nihil agitur aliud, cum parvuli baptizantur, nisi ut incorporentur ecclesiae, id est, Christi corpori membrisque socientur, manifestum est, eos ad damnationem, nisi hoc eis collatum fuerit, pertinere. De gratia et lib. arbitr. 3: Sed et illa ignorantia, quae non est eorum, qui scire nolunt, sed eorum, qui tanquam simpliciter nesciunt, neminem sic excusat, ut sempiterno igne non ardeat, si propterea non credidit, quia non audivit omnino quid crederet; sed fortasse, ut mitius ardeat (cf. contra Julianum iv. 3. Absit, ut sit in aliquo vera virtus, nisi fuerit justus. Absit autem, ut sit justus vere, nisi vivat ex fide.—Minus enim Fabricius quam Catilina punietur, non quia iste bonus, sed quia ille magis malus: et minus impius, quam Catilina, Fabricius, non veras virtutes habendo, sed a veris virtutibus non plurimum deviando).—De corrept. et grat. 7: Ac per hoc et qui Evangelium non audierunt, et qui eo audito in melius commutati perseverantiam non acceperunt, et qui Evangelio audito venire ad Christum, hoc est, in eum credere noluerunt, quoniam ipse dixit, Nemo venit ad me, nisi ei datum fuerit a Patre meo (John vi. 66.), et qui per aetatem parvulam nec credere potuerunt, sed ab originali noxa solo possent lavacro regenerationis absolvi, quo tamen non accepto mortui perierunt; non sunt ab illa conspersione discreti, quam constat esse damnatam, euntibus omnibus ex uno in condemnationem. Ibid. 13: Propter hujus ergo utilitatem secreti credendum est, quosdam de filiis perditionis non accepto dono perseverandi usque in finem, in fide, quae per dilectionem operatur, incipere vivere, et aliquamdiu fideliter ac juste vivere, et postea cadere, neque de hac vita, priusquam hoc eis contingat, auferri. De Praedest. Sanct. 8: Cur autem istum potius, quam illum liberet, inscrutabilia sunt judicia ejus et investigabiles viae ejus (Rom. xi. 33). Melius enim et hic audimus aut dicimus: O homo, tu quis es, qui respondeas Deo (Rom. ix. 20). How much perplexity the passage, 1 Tim. ii. 4: qui omnes vult homines salvos fiere occasioned Augustine, is proved by his numerous and all very forced attempts to explain it. So de corrept. et grat. c. 14. Contra Jul. iv. c. 8. Omnes i. q. multos; Enchirid. ad Laur. 103. Omnes i. q. omnis generis. De corrept. et gratia c. 15: Omnes homines Deus vult salvos fieri, quoniam nos facit velle. Enchirid. l. c. tanquam diceretur, nullum hominem fieri salvum, nisi quem fieri salvum ipse voluerit.

[33] De civ. Dei xxi. c. 23. Enchirid. ad Laur. c. 112 (see above § 84,

Such were the opposing systems, apart from the consequences with which the misrepresentations of the combatants reproached one another,[34] for the purpose of exciting universal abhorrence of the enemy's doctrine. The sentiments of Augustine were ecclesiastically confirmed by the decisions of African synods and by Zosimus in the west; although their author himself felt how

note 35). The last passage is against those who inferred from Psalm lxxvii. 10 that the punishment of hell will have an end. Still he concedes to them: Sed poenas damnatorum certis temporum intervallis existiment, si hoc eis placet, aliquatenus mitigari. Etiam sic quippe intelligi potest manere in illis ira Dei (Jo. iii. 36), h. e. ipsa damnatio—ut in ira sua, h. e. manente ira sua, non tamen contineat miserationes suas (Ps. lxxvii. 10); non aeterno supplicio finem dando, sed levamen adhibendo vel interponendo cruciatibus. In the enarrat. in Psalm cv. § 2, however, he declares even this conjecture too bold.

[34] So the Pelagians palmed on Augustine the opinion, per diabolum aliquid substantiae creatum in hominibus (Augustin. de nuptiis et concupisc. ii. 34), quasi malum naturale cum Manichaeis sapiat, qui dicit, infantes secundum Adam carnaliter natos contagium mortis antiquae prima nativitate contrahere. On the contrary, Augustinus contra Julianum lib. i. and ii. But Pelagianism also was not less misrepresented by its opponents. August. de pecc. mer. et rem. ii. 2 designates the Pelagians as tantum praesumentes de libero humanae voluntatis arbitrio, ut ad non peccandum nec adjuvandos nos divinitus opinentur. C. 5: Dicunt, accepto semel liberae voluntatis arbitrio nec orare nos debere, ut Deus nos adjuvet, ne peccemus. Epist. Conc. Carthag. ad Innocent. (Aug. epist. 175) § 6: Parvulos etiam propter salutem, quae per salvatorem Christum datur, baptizandos negant—promittentes, etiamsi non baptizentur, habituros vitam aeternam.

[35] De dono perseverantiae c. 22: Dolosi vel imperiti medici est, etiam utile medicamentum sic alligare, ut aut non prosit, aut obsit. One should not say to the church: Ita se habet de praedestinatione definita sententia voluntatis Dei, ut alii ex vobis de infidelitate, accepta obediendi voluntate, veneritis ad fidem. Quid opus est dici, alii ex vobis? Si enim Ecclesiae Dei loquimur, si credentibus loquimur, cur alios eorum ad fidem venisse dicentes caeteris facere videamur injuriam? cum possimus congruentius dicere: Ita se habet de praedestinatione definita sententia voluntatis Dei, ut ex infidelitate veneritis ad fidem accepta voluntate obediendi, et accepta perseverantia permaneatis in fide? Nec illud quod sequitur est omnino dicendum, i.e. caeteri vero qui in peccatorum delectatione remoramini, ideo nondum surrexistis, quia necdum vos adjutorium gratiae miserantis erexit: cum bene et convenienter dici possit et debeat: si qui autem adhuc in peccatorum damnabilium delectatione remoramini, apprehendite saluberrimam disciplinam: quod tamen cum feceritis, nolite extolli quasi de operibus vestris aut gloriari, quasi hoc non acceperitis; Deus est enim, qui operatur in vobis et velle et operari pro bona voluntate—de ipso autem cursu vestro bono rectoque condiscite vos ad praedestinationem divinae gratiae pertinere. Augustine is in-

dangerous they were to the interests of morality, and was able to bring them forward in popular instruction in no other than an inconsequential way. The Greek church could not but stumble at them; but it troubled itself little about such controversies.[36] The exiled western bishops hoped therefore that they would so much the more readily obtain protection in Constantinople, as they believed they had wholly in their favour the works of Chrysostom, which were highly esteemed in that place.[37]

consistent when he epist. 194. c. 4. declares prayer for the efficacy of Divine grace consonant with his system, and epist. 157. c. 2. says, we receive Divine grace humiliter petendo et faciendo, and op. imperf. iii. 107: Homines quando audiunt vel legunt, unumquemque recepturum secundum ea, quae per corpus gessit, non debent in suae voluntatis virtute confidere, sed orare potius talem sibi a Domino preparari voluntatem, ut non intrent in tentationem.

[36] Comp. the refutation of Augustine's doctrines by Theodore of Mopsuestia ap. Marius Mercator ed. Baluz. p. 399 ss. ex. gr. p. 342: Nihil horum prospicere potuit mirabilis peccati originalis assertor, quippe qui in divinis scripturis nequaquam fuerit exercitatus, nec ab infantia, juxta b. Pauli vocem, sacras didicerit literas.—Novissime vero in hanc dogmatis recidit novitatem, qua diceret, quod in ira atque furore Deus Adam mortalem esse praeceperit, et propter ejus unum delictum cunctos etiam necdum natos homines morte multaverit. Sic autem disputans non veretur nec confunditur ea sentire de Deo, quae nec de hominibus sanum sapientibus et aliquam justitiae curam gerentibus unquam quis aestimare tentavit caet.—The Greek church historians are altogether silent concerning the Pelagian controversy.

[37] So Julian appealed to Chrysostom. See August. contra Jul. i. c. 6 s. With the same view Annianus, doubtless the Annianus Pseudodiaconus Celedensis who is mentioned by Hieron. ad August. (August. ep. 202) as a writer in favour of Pelagianism, and who was also present at the synod of Diospolis (see Garnerii diss. i. ad Marium Mercat. c. 7.), translated into Latin numerous homilies of Chrysostom, of which hom. viii. in Matth. and hom. vii. de laudibus S. Pauli still exist. Comp. his Prologus ad Orontium Episc. (who was condemned at Ephesus for being a Pelagian) prefixed to the hom. in Matth. (Chrysost. opp. ed. Montfaucon T. vii. init.): Quid enim vel ad prudentiam eruditius, vel ad exercitationem ignitius, vel ad dogma purgatius nostrorum auribus offeratur, quam praeclara haec tam insignis animi ingeniique monumenta? Et hoc maxime tempore, quo per occasionem quarundam nimis difficilium quaestionum aedificationi morum atque ecclesiasticae disciplinae satis insolenter obstrepitur.—Quid pressius ille commendat, quam ingenitae nobis a Deo libertatis decus, cujus confessio praecipuum inter nos gentilesque discrimen est, qui hominem, ad imaginem Dei conditum, tam infeliciter fati violentia et peccandi putant necessitate devinctum, ut is etiam pecoribus invidere cogatur? Quid ille adversus eosdem magistros potius insinuat, quam Dei esse possibilia mandata, et hominem totius vel quae jubetur vel suadetur a Deo capacem esse virtutis? Quo quidem solo et

Hence they applied particularly to Nestor, who had been bishop of the see of Constantinople since 428. But when very prejudicial representations of Pelagianism had been disseminated from the west, especially by *Marius Mercator*,[38] who was personally present in Constantinople,[39] Nestorius saw the necessity of giving prominence to the ruinous consequences of the fall and the necessity of baptism, which the Pelagians were said to deny.[40] But on the contrary, he found the Pelagians themselves who had fled to him, so little heterodox, that he asked from the Romish bishop Caelestine (429) an explanation respecting the grounds of their condemnation.[41] This very relation of the Pelagians to Nestorius was ruinous to them in the west; an inter-

iniquitas ab imperante propellitur, et praevaricanti reatus affigitur. Jam vero iste eruditorum decus cum de gratia Dei disserit, quanta illam ubertate, quanta etiam cautione concelebrat! Non enim est in alterutro aut incautus, aut nimius, sed in utroque moderatus. Sic liberas ostendit hominum voluntates, ut ad Dei tamen mandata facienda divinae gratiae necessarium ubique fateatur auxilium: sic continuum divinae gratiae auxilium commendat, ut nec studia voluntatis interimat. Chrysost. in epist. ad Rom. hom. x. expressly rejects as an absurdity the opinion that by Adam's disobedience another person becomes a sinner. On the relation of grace to freedom he speaks in epist. ad Hebr. hom. xii.

[38] Opera ed. Jo. Garnerius, Paris. 1673. fol., better Steph. Baluzius, Par. 1684. 8. (reprinted in Gallandii bibl. vett. Patr. viii. 613.) In the Commonitorium adv. haeresin Pelagii et Caelestii vel etiam scripta Juliani, ed. Baluz. p. 1. Commonitorium super nomine Caelestii (429 presented to the emperor Theodosius II.) p. 132.

[39] Marius Mercator always gives special prominence to the tenets of Caelestius (see note 4), though Pelagius had rejected most of them at the synod of Diospolis.

[40] Nestorii sermones iv. contra Pelagium (latin, partly in nothing but an extract in Marius Mercator p. 120. The four discourses in the original among Chrysostom's orations ed. Monfaucon x. p. 733) are not aimed directly against Pelagius.

[41] Marius Merc. p. 119: contra haeresin Pelagii seu Caelestii—quamvis recte sentiret et doceret, Julianum tamen ex Episcopo Eclanensi cum participibus suis hujus haeresis signiferum et antesignanum, olim ab apostolica sententia exauctoratum atque depositum, in amicitiam interim censuit suscipiendum. Spem enim absolutionis promittens, ipsum quoque Caelestium litteris suis—consolatus est. This writing follows p. 131. On this account Nestorius applied in the year 429 to the Romish bishop Caelestine, in two letters (ap. Baronius ad ann. 430. no. 3. ap. Coustant among the epistt. Caelest. ep. vi. and vii.). In the first: Julianus caet. —saepe—Imperatorem adierunt, ac suas causas defleverunt, tanquam orthodoxi temporibus orthodoxis persecutionem passi, saepe eadem et apud nos lamentantes.—Sed quoniam apertiore nobis de causis eorum notitia opus est,—dignare nobis notitiam de his largiri caet.

nal necessary connection between Pelagianism and Nestorianism was hunted out,[42] and at the third general council at Ephesus (431) Pelagianism was condemned along with Nestorianism.[43] Yet the Augustinian doctrine of grace and predestination was never adopted in the east.[44]

But even in the west, where this doctrine had been ecclesiastically ratified, there were never more than a few who held to it in its fearful consequences. Its injurious practical effects could not be overlooked, and appeared occasionally in outward manifestation.[45] The monks in particular were naturally opposed to a view which annihilated all the meritoriousness of their monkish exercises.[46] Hence Augustine soon found his doctrine disputed even by opponents of the Pelagians.[47] The monks of *Massilia* especially, adopted a view of free grace between that of Augustine and that of Pelagius, which seems to have originated chiefly with *John Cassian* († soon after 432),[48] a disciple

[42] See below § 88. not. 18.

[43] See below § 88. not. 27.

[44] Münscher's Dogmengeschichte iv. 238.

[45] Comp. the memorable controversy among the monks of Adrumetum 426 and 427. August. epistt. 214—216. Retractt. ii. 66. 67. Some (ep. 214.) sic gratiam praedicant, ut negent hominis esse liberum arbitrium, et, quod est gravius, dicant, quod in die judicii non sit redditurus Deus unicuique secundum opera ejus. They said accordingly (retr. ii. 67), neminem corripiendum, si Dei praecepta non facit, sed pro illo ut faciat, tantummodo orandum (different after all only in the form, not essentially, from the doctrines of Augustine!). Others (ep. 215.) asserted, like the Semipelagians, secundum aliqua merita humana dari gratiam Dei. A strictly Augustinian party stood between. Against the first Augustine wrote de correptione et gratia; against the second de gratia et libero arbitrio. Comp. Walch's Ketzerhist. 245 ff.

[46] Comp. for example Cassiani coll. xix. 8: Finis quidem Coenobitae est, omnes suas mortificare et crucifigere voluntates, ac secundum evangelicae perfectionis salutare mundatum nihil de crastino cogitare. Quam perfectionem prorsus a nemine, nisi a Coenobita impleri posse certissimum est.

[47] Joh. Geffcken hist. Semipelagianismi antiquissima. Gotting. 1826. 4. Wiggers Darstellung des Augustinismus u. Pelagianismus, 2ter Th. —On the differences between him and Vitalis see August. epist. 217. Walch v. 9. Geffcken p. 40 ss. Wiggers ii. 198.

[48] His works: De institutis Coenobiorum libb. xii. Collationes Patrum xxiv. De incarnatione Christi adv. Nestorium libb. vii.—Opp. ed. Alardus Gazaeus. Duaci 1616. 3 T. 8. auct. Atrebati 1628 fol. (Reprinted Francof. 1722 and Lips. 1733 fol.)—cf. G. F. Wiggers de Joanne Cassiano Massiliensi, qui Semipelagianismi auctor vulgo perhibetur, comm. iii. Rostochii 1824. and 25. 4. The same author's Augusti-

of Chrysostom.[49] Augustine received the first account of these *Massilians*, or, as they were first named by the Scholastics, *Semipelagians*, from his zealous adherents *Prosper* of Aquitania, and *Hilary* (429),[50] and attempted to bring them over to his views in his last two works, (429, 430).[51] After Augustine's

nismus u. Pelag. ii. 7. Jean Cassien, sa vie et ses écrits, thèse par L. F. Meyer. Strasbourg 1840. 4.

[49] Comp. especially Collat. xiii. (according to Wiggers ii. 37.. written between 428 and 431, according to Geffcken p. 6. somewhat before 426). Among other things we find in c. 9: Propositum namque Dei, quo non ob hoc hominem fecerat ut periret, sed ut in perpetuum viverit, manet immobile. Cujus benignitas cum bonae voluntatis in nobis quantulamcunque scintillam emicuisse perspexerit, vel quam ipse tamquam de dura silice nostri cordis excusserit, confovet eam et exsuscitat, suaque inspiratione confortat, volens omnes homines salvos fieri, et ad agnitionem veritatis venire (1 Tim. ii. 4).—Qui enim ut pereat unus ex pusillis non habet voluntatem, quomodo sine ingenti sacrilegio putandus est, non universaliter omnes, sed quosdam salvos fieri velle pro omnibus?—c. 8: Adest inseparabiliter nobis semper divina prosectio, tantaque est erga creaturam suam pietas creatoris, ut non solum comitetur eam, sed etiam praecedat jugi providentia.—Qui cum in nobis ortum quendam bonae voluntatis inspexerit, illuminat eam confestim, atque confortat, et incitat ad salutem, incrementum tribuens ei, quam vel ipse plantavit, vel nostro conatu viderit emersisse.—Et non solum sancta desideria benignus inspirat, sed etiam occasiones praestruit vitae, et opportunitatem boni effectus ac salutaris viae directionem demonstrat errantibus.—c. 9: Ut autem evidentius clareat, etiam per naturae bonum, quod beneficio creatoris indultum est, nonnunquam bonarum voluntatum prodire principia, quae tamen nisi a Domino dirigantur, ad consummationem virtutum pervenire non possunt, Apostolus testis est dicens: Velle adjacet mihi, perficere autem bonum non invenio (Rom. vii. 18).—c. 11: Haec duo, i.e. vel gratia Dei, vel liberum arbitrium, sibi quidem invicem videntur adversa, sed utraque concordant, et utraque nos pariter debere suscipere, pietatis ratione colligimus, ne unum horum homini subtrahentes, ecclesiasticae fidei regulam excessisse videamur. c. 12: Unde cavendum est nobis, ne ita ad Dominum omnia sanctorum merita referamus, ut nihil nisi id quod malum atque perversum est humanae adscribamus naturae.—Dubitari ergo non potest, inesse quidem omni animae naturaliter virtutum semina beneficio creatoris inserta, sed nisi haec opitulatione Dei fuerint excitata, ad incrementum perfectionis non poterunt pervenire. Collat. iii. c. 12. Nullus justorum sibi sufficit ad obtinendam justitiam, nisi per moment asingula titubanti ei et corruenti fulcimenta manus suae supposuerit divina clementia. Wiggers ii. 47.

[50] Ep. Prosperi ad August. among Augustine's epistles ep. 225, ep. Hilarii 226. Wiggers ii. 153.

[51] De praedestinatione Sanctorum liber ad Prosperum. De dono perseverantiae liber ad Prosperum et Hilarium (s. liber secundus de praedest. Sanct.).

death, *Prosper* († 460)[52] continued the controversy with greater violence, but could not prevent the Semipelagian doctrines from spreading farther, especially in Gaul. To these Semipelagians also belonged *Vincentius* Lirinensis († 450) whose *Commonitorium*, composed in the year 434, was one of the works most read in the west as a standard book of genuine Catholicism.[53]

III. CONTROVERSIES CONCERNING THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

§ 88.

NESTORIAN CONTROVERSY.

SOURCES: Nestor's own account (Evagrius hist. eccl. i. 7.) was made use of by Irenaeus (Comes, then from 444 to 448, bishop of Tyre) in his Tragoedia s. comm. de rebus in synodo Ephesina, ac in Oriente toto gestis. This last work of Irenaeus is lost; but the original documents appended to it were transferred in the sixth century, in a Latin translation to the Synodicon (Variorum epist. ad Conc. Eph. pertinentes ex Ms. Casin. ed. Chr. Lupus. Lovan. 1682. 4. in an improved form ap. Mansi v. 731, and in Theodoreti opp. ed. Schulze v. 608). Marius Mercator also has many fragments of Acts, opp. P. ii. (see above § 87, not. 38.) A complete collection of all the Acts is given in Mansi iv. p. 567

[52] Works: Epistola ad Rufinum de gratia et libero arbitrio. Carmen de ingratis. Epigrammata ii. in obtrectatorem S. Augustini, all belonging to 429 and 430.—Epitaphium Nestorianae et Pelagianae haereseos. 431. Comp. Wiggers ii. 169. Against new opponents (comp. Walch v. 67. Geffcken p. 32. Wiggers ii. 184): Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula objectionum Gallorum calumniantium. Pro Augustini doctrina resp. ad capitula objectionum Vincentianarum (doubtless Vinc. Lirin.). Pro Augustino respons. ad excerpta, quae de Genuensi civitate sunt missa. De gratia Dei et libero arbitrio lib. s. contra Collatorem (about 432. Wiggers ii. 138). Besides see Chronicon (till 454).—Opp. ed. Jo. le Brun de Marette et D. Mangeaut. Paris. 1711. fol. cum var. lectt. ex Codd. Vatic. Romae 1758. 8.

[53] Commonitorium pro catholicae fidei antiquitate et universitate adv. profanas omnium haereticor. novitates. Often published among others, cum August. de doctr. christ. ed. G. Calixtus. Helmst. 1629. 8. (ed. ii. 1655. 4.) cum Salviani opp. ed. St. Baluzius. (Paris. 1663. ed. ii. 1669. ed. iii. 1684. 8.) ed. Engelb. Klüpfel. Viennae 1809. Herzog. Vratisl. 1839. 8. comp. Wiggers ii. 208. That this Vincentius is the one who was attacked by Prosper, and that even in the Commonitorium Semipelagian traces are found, has been proved by Vossius, Norisius, Natalis, Alexander, Oudinus de scriptt. eccl. i. 1231. Geffcken p. 53. Wiggers ii. 195. On the contrary side Act. SS. Maji vol. v. p. 284 ss. Hist. littéraire de la France T. ii. p. 309.

ss. and T. V.—Account of this controversy by Ibas, bishop of Edessa, in the epist. ad Marin Persam (mostly contained in the Actis Conc. Chalced. Act. x. ap. Mansi vii. p. 241 ss.).—Liberatus's (archdeacon in Carthage about 553) breviarium causae Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum (ed. Jo. Garnerius. Paris 1675. 8. ap. Mansi ix. p. 659, and in Gallandii bibl. PP. xii. p. 119).—Besides Socrates vii. c. 29 ss. Evagrius i. c. 7. ss.

Walch's Ketzerhistorie v. 289. Wundemann's Gesch. d. Glaubenslehre ii. 265. Münscher's Dogmengeschichte iv. 53. Neander's Kirchengesch. ii. iii. 927. Baur's Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit u. Menschwerdung Gottes in ihrer geschichtl. Entwickelung i. 693.

In the Arian controversy the doctrine concerning Christ's person had been touched upon, but without being fully developed. When the Arians inferred from the catholic doctrine of one human soul in Christ that there were two persons,[1] the Orientals indeed could not be led astray by this means from holding fast the human in Christ, as long as they remained true to their historico-exegetical principles;[2] but the Nicenians in Egypt and the west began to give strong prominence to the unity of the Divine person, for the purpose of obviating that Arian objection,[3] and to consider Christ accordingly in all relations as God.[4]

[1] See § 83. not. 28.

[2] So Eusebius of Emesa (§ 84. not. 18) in the fragments in Theodoreti Eranistes dial. iii. (Opp. ed Schulze iv. 258), and in the work de fide adv. Sabellium, in so far as we can venture to ascribe this work to him. See Thilo über die Schriften des Euseb. v. Alex. u. des Euseb. v. Emisa s. 75.

[3] Athanas. de incarnat. verbi (opp. ed. Montfaucon ii. 1. ap. Mansi iv. 689): Ὁμολογοῦμεν καὶ εἶναι αὐτὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Θεὸν κατὰ πνεῦμα, υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου κατὰ σάρκα· οὐ δύο φύσεις τὸν ἕνα υἱόν, μίαν προσκυνητὴν καὶ μίαν ἀπροσκύνητον· ἀλλὰ μίαν φύσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένην, καὶ προσκυνουμένην μετὰ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ μιᾷ προσκυνήσει. Since Cyril, a follower of Athanasius, appeals to this passage (lib. de recta fide ad Imperatrices § 9), it has by this means the most important external testimony in its favour. Several writings were assigned to the Romish bishop Julius I., in which the unity existing in Christ was strongly expressed. There are still extant the epist. ad Dionysium (ap. Mansi ii. 1191. A. Maji scriptt. vett. nova coll. vii. i. 144), cited as genuine by Gennadius (about 490), in which the μία φύσις is expressly and plainly asserted; the epist. ad Prosdocium (ex. cod. Oxon. ed. J. G. Ehrlich, Lips. 1750. 4), regarded as genuine by the council of Ephesus, by Cyril, Marius Mercator, Facundus, and Ephraem bishop of Antioch about 526 (Photii cod. 229.), which rejects the phrase ἄνθρωπος ὑπὸ Θεοῦ προσληφθείς, and three fragments lately published by Majus l. c. vii. i. 165, the first and third of which are mentioned by Ephraem, l. c. How strongly also Hilary was inclined to the doctrine of one nature may be seen in Münscher's Dogmengesch. iv. 16. Baur's Dreieinigkeit i. 681. By this means the mode of expression in the writings of Julius is rendered more intelligible from the ge-

When Apollinaris, following this tendency still farther, denied to Christ a reasonable human soul, his opponents it is true were united in asserting that Christ is perfect God and man in one person, but in the east they were now accustomed to distinguish the two natures, and the expressions used concerning them, with greater care; and the two most eminent men of the Antiocheni-

neral tendency of the west at that time.—After Eutyches and the later Monophysites continually appealed to Athanasius, the Romish bishop Felix (270—275), and Julius (337—352), and to Gregory Thaumaturgus, as unam naturam Dei verbi decernentes post unitionem, whose testimonia Cyrillus in libb. adv. Diodorum et Theodorum has put together. See Collatio Catholicorum cum Severianias A.D. p. 531 Mansi viii. 820; a Jacobite collection of this kind translated from the Arabic, see spicilegium Rom. iii. 694.), many Catholics began to assert that these testimonies have been interpolated by Apollinarists (see Collatio l. c. p. 821. Leontius de sectis act. viii. Justinianus Imp. contra Monophys. in Maji scriptt. vett. nov. coll. vii. i. 302), notwithstanding Ephraem bishop of Antioch, about 526 (Photii cod. 229), and Eulogius bishop of Alexandria, about 580 (Phot. cod. 230), admit the genuineness of the passage of Athanasius and of the ep. Julii ad Prosdocium. Leontius (contra Monophys. ap. Majus vii. i. 143 s.) appeals to the testimony of Polemon, a disciple of Apollinaris, as proof that the passage ascribed to Athanasius belongs to Apollinaris. The place in question in Polemon may be completely put together from the two quotations p. 143 and p. 16, but it says something quite different. Polemon speaks against the inconsistency of those who asserted *μίαν φύσιν τοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένην*, and yet assume in Christ *θεὸν τέλειον* and *ἄνθρωπον τέλειον*, while Apollinaris had rightly rejected the two natures, and taught *εἶναι αὐτὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ* (as above in the passage of Athanasius). In short, Polemon meant to say, Athanasius had borrowed that doctrine from Apollinaris, but fell into an inconsistency with himself in so doing. Ap. Majus l. c. p. 16. there is also a fragment of Apollinarii epist. ad Jovian., in which that passage has been interpolated word for word as above; but it does not at all suit the construction, a sign that it has been inserted—.The moderns, however, especially Catholic writers, have retained the view, that all those writings proceeded from Apollinaris. It has been defended in reference to the letters of Julius, particularly by Muratori anecdota graeca p. 341 ss.; and with regard to all those passages above named by Le Quien dissert. Damasc. ii. prefixed to his edition of Joannes Damasc. T. i. p. xxxii. ss. Comp. on the other side Salig de Eutychianismo ante Eutychen. Guelpherbyt. 1723. p. 112 ss. p. 365 ss.

[4] Thus Mary is called *θεοτόκος* by Eusebius de vita Const. iii. 43. Cyrillus Hieros. catech. x. p. 146. Athanasius orat. iii. contra Arian. c. 14. 33. Didymus de trin. i. 31. 94; ii. 4. 133, and Gregory of Nazianzum goes so far as to declare the man godless who will not employ this appellation. Hesychius, presbyter in Jerusalem († 343), calls David *θεοπάτωρ* (Photius cod. 275). In many apocryphal writings James is called *ἀδελφόθεος* (see Thilo Acta Thomae in the notit. über. p. x. ss. cf. Photius cod. 142).

an school, *Diodore, bishop of Tarsus,*[5] *and Theodore,* bishop of Mopsuestia,[6] confirmed the accuracy of this distinction by their writings, which were still highly esteemed in the whole east, while in Egypt the formula of Athanasius respecting a Divine nature made flesh was maintained. On the other hand,[7] *Ambrose*[8] and *Augustine*[9] in the west endeavoured, after the exam-

[5] Comp. § 84. not. 21. See the fragments ap Leontius contra Eutychianos et Nestorianos, in Canisii thesaur. monum. eccl. ed Basnage i. 591).

[6] See § 84, not. 24. In Theodore's confession of faith (Act. Conc. Ephesini Act. vi. ap. Mansi T. iv. p. 1347. in latin in Marius Mercator see Walch bibl: symb. vetus p. 203 ss.):—Χρὴ δὲ καὶ περὶ τῆς οἰκονομίας, ἣν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὸν δεσπότην Χριστὸν οἰκονομίᾳ ὁ δεσπότης ἐξετέλεσε θεὸς, εἰδέναι, ὅτι ὁ δεσπότης θεὸς λόγος ἄνθρωπον εἵληφε τέλειον, ἐκ σπέρματος ὄντα Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Δαυὶδ,—ἐκ ψυχῆς τε νοερᾶς καὶ σαρκὸς συνεστῶτα ἀνθρωπίνης ὃν ἄνθρωπον ὄντα καθ' ἡμᾶς τὴν φύσιν, πνεύματος ἁγίου δυνάμει ἐν τῇ τῆς παρθένου μήτρᾳ διαπλασθέντα, γενόμενον ὑπὸ γυναικὸς καὶ γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον—ἀποῤῥήτως συνῆψεν ἑαυτῷ. Θανάτου μὲν αὐτὸν κατὰ νόμον ἀνθρώπων πειρασθῆναι κατασκευάσας, ἐγείρας δὲ ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ ἀναγαγὼν εἰς οὐρανὸν, καὶ καθίσας ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅθεν δὴ ὑπεράνω πάσης ὑπάρχων ἀρχῆς, καὶ ἐξουσίας—τὴν παρὰ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως δέχεται προσκύνησιν, ὡς ἀχώριστον πρὸς τὴν θείαν φύσιν ἔχων τὴν συνάφειαν, ἀναφορᾷ θεοῦ καὶ ἐννοίᾳ πάσης αὐτῷ τῆς κτίσεως τὴν προσκύνησιν ἀπονεμούσης. Καὶ οὔτε δύο φαμὲν υἱοὺς, οὔτε δύο κυρίους. ἐπειδὴ εἷς θεὸς κατ' οὐσίαν ὁ θεὸς λόγος—, ᾧπερ αὖτος συνημμένος τε καὶ μετέχων θεότητος κοινωνεῖ τῆς υἱοῦ προσηγορίας τε καὶ τιμῆς· καὶ κύριος κατ' οὐσίαν ὁ θεὸς λόγος, ᾧ συνημμένος οὗτος κοινωνεῖ τῆς τιμῆς.—Ἕνα τοίνυν τὸν κυρίον φαμεν καὶ κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο· πρωτοτύπως μὲν τὸν θεὸν λόγον νοοῦντες, τὸν κατ' οὐσίαν υἱὸν θεοῦ καὶ κύριον, συνεπινοοῦντες δὲ τὸ ληφθὲν, Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲθ, ὃν ἔχρισεν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει, ὡς ἐν τῇ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν λόγον συναφείᾳ υἱότητός τε μετέχοντα καὶ κυριότητος. Ὃς καὶ δεύτερος Ἀδὰμ κατὰ τὸν μακάριον καλεῖται Παῦλον κ. τ. λ. Comp. the fragments of this confession in the acts of the fifth general council at Constantinople A.D. 553. ap Mansi ix. 203, and in Leontii contra Eutych. et Nestor lib. iii. ap. Canisiûs-Basnage i. 585. The latter fragments, published only in Latin by Canisius, were published in the Greek original by Majus scriptt. vett. nova coll. vi. 300.

[7] Münscher's Dogmengesch. iv. 32. Baur's Dreieinigkeit i. 653.

[8] Comp. especially the fragments in Theodoreti dial. ii. (ed. Schulze iv. 139).

[9] Augustini ep. 169 ad Evodium. § 7: homo—in unitatem personae Verbi Dei—coaptatus est, permanente tamen Verbo in sua natura incommutabiliter. § 8: sicut in homine—anima et corpus una persona est, ita in Christo Verbum et homo una persona est. Et sicut homo, verbi gratia, philosophus non utique nisi secundum animam dicitur, nec ideo tamen absurde—dicimus philosophum caesum, philosophum mortuum—cum totum secundum carnem accidat, non secundum illud, quod est philosophus: ita Christus Deus—et tamen recte dicitur Deus crucifixus, cum hoc eum secundum carnem passum esse, non secundum illud,

ple of the two Gregorys, to avoid the two rocks of this doctrine, viz. the division into two persons, and the mistaking of two natures; and thus the Gallic monk *Leporius*, in Africa, (about 426), occasioned the prelude of the Nestorian controversy, while forced to retract assertions by which the unity of Christ's person appeared to be endangered.[10]

Nestorius, a presbyter of Antioch, by his elevation to the see of Constantinople, came into a difficult position (428), as far as he had both to contend against envious rivals, and was also obliged, by his extraction and position,[11] to undertake the task of completing the incipient restoration of Chrysostom's honour, which *Cyril*,[12] the nephew and worthy successor of Theophilus,[13]

quo Dominus gloriae est, non habeatur incertum. Ep. 137 ad Volusianum § 9: ita inter Deum et homines mediator apparuit, ut in unitate personae copulans utramque naturam, et solita sublimaret insolitis, et insolita solitis temperaret. § 11: Ergo persona hominis mixtura est animae et corporis: persona autem Christi mixtura est Dei et hominis. Enchiridion ad Laur. c. 34, 36.

[10] Comp. epistola Episcop. Africae ad Episc. Galliae and Leporii libellus emendationis (prim. ed. Jac. Sirmond. Paris 1530. Mansi iv. 517). In the latter it is said: Tametsi Christum filium Dei tunc etiam natum de sancta Maria non negaremus, sicut ipsi recordamini; sed minime attendentes ad mysterium fidei, non ipsum Deum hominem natum, sed perfectum cum Deo natum hominem dicebamus; pertimescentes scilicet, ne divinitati conditionem adsignaremus humanam. His present faith: Confitemur dominum ac Deum nostrum Jesum Christum unicum filium Dei, qui ante saecula natus ex patre est, novissimo tempore de Spiritu sancto et Maria semper virgine factum hominem, Deum natum: et confitentes utramque substantiam carnis et Verbi, unum eundemque Deum atque hominem inseparabilem pia fidei credulitate suscepimus; et ex tempore susceptae carnis sic omnia dicimus, quae erant Dei, transisse in hominem, ut omnia, quae erant hominis, in Deum venirent; ut hac intelligentia verbum factum sit caro, non ut conversione aut mutabilitate aliqua coeperit esse quod non erat, sed ut potentia divinae dispensationis Verbum patris, nunquam a patre discedens, homo proprie fieri dignaretur, incarnatusque sit unigenitus secreto illo mysterio, quod ipse novit. Nostrum namque est credere, illius nosse. Ac sic, ut ipse Deus Verbum, totum suscipiens quod est hominis, homo sit, et adsumtus homo, totum accipiendo quod est Dei, aliud quam Deus esse non possit. Cf. Cassianus de incarnatione Christi i. 5.

[11] Thus for instance against Proclus and Philip, presbyters in Constantinople, both of whom had expectations of being raised to the episcopate. Socrates vii. 26, 29.

[12] His writings: Commentaries of no value. Adv. Nestorium libb. 5. New controversial works against Nestorius in Maji nova coll. viii. ii. 59. Contra Julianum libb. 10. Homiliae (among others paschales 30). Epistolae 61, &c. Opp. ed. Jo. Aubert. Paris 1638. T. vii. fol.

bishop of Alexandria, († 444) considered derogatory to the honour of his see.[14] He soon gave an opportunity to the malevolent watcher of his proceedings by denying the propriety of calling Mary Θεοτόκος.[15] A bitter but fruitless correspondence took

[13] The admonition addressed to him by the pious Isidore, abbot of Pelusium, serves to characterise him (lib. i. ep. 370): παῦσον τὰς ἐριδας· μὴ [add. εἰς] οἰκείας ὕβρεως ἄμυναν, ἣν παρὰ Θνητῶν κεχρεώστησαι, ζῶσαν ἐκκλησίαν μεθόδευε, καὶ αἰώνιον αὐτῇ διχόνοιαν ἐν προσχήματι εὐσεβείας κατασκεύαζε. It may refer to that affair of Chrysostom, or to the commencement of the controversy with Nestorius.

[14] The bishop of Constantinople, Atticus, about 420, had been obliged to introduce Chrysostom's name with the Diptychs, after the example of Antioch and at the pressing request of the people, and invited Cyril to do the same (Attici ep. ad Cyrillum in Cyrilli op. v. iii. 201). The latter, however, refused to comply with the demand, desiring that the sentence pronounced on Chrysostom should be righteously maintained (l. c. p. 204). However, immediately after Nestor's elevation, new demonstrations of honour were added, Marcellinus Comes (about 534) in Chronico ad ann. 428 (Chronica medii aevi ed. Roesler i. 262): Beatissimi Joannis Episcopi dudum malorum Episcoporum invidia exulati apud Comitatum (at the imperial court) coepit memoria celebrari mense Sept. d. xxvi. That Cyril continued to regard the condemnation of Chrysostom as a righteous measure is shown by his epistola ad Acacium (ap. Mansi v. 832. Theodoreti opp. ed. Schulze v. 699).

[15] Extracts from Nestor's discourses in the Greek original are given in the Actis Syn. Ephesin. b. Mansi iv. 1197. Nestorii sermones in a Latin version ap. Marius Mercator (ed. Baluz. p. 53 ss). From the first address: Θεοτόκος i.e. puerpera Dei s. genitrix Dei Maria, an autem ἀνθρωποτόκος i.e. hominis genitrix? Habet matrem Deus? Ergo excusabilis gentilitas matres diis subintroducens. Paulus ergo mendax de Christi deitate dicens ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἄνευ γενεαλογίας (Hebr. vii. 3). Non peperit creatura increabilem, sed peperit hominem deitatis instrumentum. Non creavit Deum Verbum Spiritus sanctus—sed Deo verbo templum fabricatus est, quod habitaret, ex virgine (according to Joh. ii. 21). Est, et non est mortuus incarnatus Deus, sed illum, in quo incarnatus est, suscitavit: inclinatus est elevare, quod ruerat, ipse vero non cecidit. Si jacentem elevare volueris, nonne continges corpus corpore, et te ipsum illi conjungendo elisum eriges, atque ita illi conjunctus ipse manes quod eras? Sic et illud incarnationis aestima sacramentum. Propter utentem illud indumentum, quod utitur, colo, propter absconditum adorans quod foris videtur: inseparabilis ab eo, qui oculis paret, est Deus. Divido naturas, sed conjungo reverentiam. Dominicam itaque incarnationem intremiscamus, τὴν Θεοδόχον τῷ Θεῷ λόγῳ· συνθεολογῶμεν μορφήν i.e. susceptricem Dei formam una ac pari qua Deum Verbum deitatis ratione veneremur, tanquam divinitatis vere inseparabilis simulacrum, tanquam imaginem absconditi judicis. Duplicem confiteamur, et adoremus ut unum: duplum enim naturarum unum est propter unitatem. Sermo iii. (ib. p. 71): Ego natum et mortuum Deum et sepultum adorare non queo. Qui natus est et per partes incrementorum temporibus eguit,

place between them.[16] Cyril resolved to make a bishop of Constantinople once more feel the superior weight of Alexandria. By misrepresenting the doctrines of Nestor to *Caelestine*, bishop of Rome,[17] he created the prejudice among the westerns, or at

et mensibus legitimis portatus in ventre est, hic humanam habet naturam, sed Deo sane conjunctam. Aliud est autem dicere, quia nato de Maria conjunctus erat Deus ille, qui est Verbum patris caet. Comp. the extracts in the Actis Syn. Eph. p. 1197: Ὅταν οὖν ἡ θεία γραφὴ μέλλῃ λέγειν ἢ γέννησιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, ἢ θάνατον, οὐδαμοῦ φαίνεται τιθεῖσα τὸ θεός, ἀλλ' ἢ Χριστός, ἢ υἱός, ἢ κύριος. τὸ προελθεῖν τὸν θεὸν λόγον ἐκ τῆς χριστοτόκου παρθένου, παρὰ τῆς θείας ἐδιδάχθην γραφῆς· το δὲ γεννηθῆναι θεὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς, οὐδαμοῦ ἐδιδάχθην.

[16] Cyril proclaimed Nestor's erroneous doctrine on all sides. This naturally provoked opposition, so that even to Acacius, bishop of Berhoea, a zealous adherent of Nestor named Dorotheus, in the church of Constantinople, said directly: εἴ τις λέγει θεοτόκον τὴν Μαρίαν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. The hoary Acacius sought in vain to exorcise the storm (epist. ad Cyrill. in Cyrilli opp. v. iii. 63): it was the duty of bishops, κατασταῖλαι τὴν ἐξαγγελθεῖσαν φωνὴν, ὅπως μὴ πρόφασις δοθῇ τοῖς διασχίζειν καὶ διατέμνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἑτοίμως ἐχουσι. Many in Constantinople συνηγορεῖν δοκοῦσι τῷ ῥηθέντι ῥητῷ, οὐκ ἐναντίως ἔχοντι κατὰ διάνοιαν τῇ ἀποστολικῇ πίστει, &c.

[17] Cyrilli epist. ad Caelestium and commonitorium datum Possidonio (his messenger) ap. Mansi iv. 1012 ss. and p. 548, and ap. Coustant. In this last we read: Ἡ Νεστορίου πίστις, μᾶλλον δὲ κακοδοξία, ταύτην ἔχει τὴν δύναμιν· Φησὶν ὅτι ὁ θεὸς λόγος προεγνωκὼς, ὅτι ὁ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου γεννώμενος ἅγιος ἔσται καὶ μέγας, εἰς τοῦτ' ἐξελέξατο αὐτὸν, καὶ παρεσκεύασε μὲν γεννηθῆναι δίχα ἀνδρὸς ἐκ τῆς παρθένου, ἐχαρίσατο δὲ αὐτῷ τὸ καλεῖσθαι τοῖς αὐτοῦ ὀνόμασιν, καὶ ἤγειρεν αὐτόν. Ὥστε κἂν ἐνανθρωπήσας λέγηται ὁ μονογενὴς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος, ὅτι συνῆν ἀεί, ὡς ἀνθρώπῳ ἁγίῳ τῷ ἐκ τῆς παρθένου, διὰ τοῦτο λέγεται ἐνανθρωπῆσαι. Ὥσπερ δὲ συνῆν τοῖς προφήταις, οὕτω, φησὶ, καὶ τούτῳ κατὰ μείζονα συνάφειαν. Διὰ τοῦτο φεύγει πανταχοῦ τὸ λέγειν τὴν ἕνωσιν, ἀλλ' ὀνομάζει συνάφειαν, ὥσπερ ἐστιν ὃς ἔξωθεν, καὶ ὡς ἂν λέγῃ πρὸς Ἰησοῦν, ὅτι καθ' ὡς ἦν μετὰ Μωϋσῆ, οὕτως ἔσομαι μετὰ σοῦ (Jos. i. 5). Κρύπτων δὲ τὴν ἀσέβειαν λέγει, ὅτι ἐκ μήτρας συνῆν αὐτῷ. Διὰ τοῦτο οὔτε θεὸν ἀληθινὸν αὐτὸς εἶναι λέγει, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐν εὐδοκίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ κεκλημένον οὕτως· κἂν κύριος ὠνομάσθη, οὕτως πάλιν αὐτὸν βούλεται κύριον, ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου χαρισαμένου αὐτῷ τὸ καλεῖσθαι καὶ οὕτω. Μὴ φησὶν, ὅτι, ὅπερ λέγομεν, ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἀναστῆναι. ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἀπέθανε, καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἀνέστη, καὶ οὐδὲν τοῦτο πρὸς τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον. —καὶ ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις σῶμά ἐστιν ἀνθρώπου τὸ προκείμενον· ἡμεῖς δὲ πιστεύομεν, ὅτι τοῦ λόγου ἐστὶ σάρξ ζωοποιεῖν ἰσχύουσα διὰ τοῦτο, ὅτι τοῦ τὰ πάντα ζωοποιοῦντος λόγου γέγονε σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα. Nestor replies to this (Synodicon c. vi. Mansi v. 762): Ille vero (Cyrillus), omittens mihi per epistolam declarare, si quid ei tamquam blasphemum vel impium videbatur debere notari, convictionum terrore permotus, et adjutrices ob hoc perturbationes exquirens, ad Romanum Caelestinum convertitur, quippe ut ad simpliciorem, quam qui posset vim dogmatum subtilius penetrare. Et ad haec inveniens viri illius simplicitatem, circumfert pueriliter aures ejus illusi-

least strengthened it, that Nestorianism was only an offshoot of Pelagianism,[18] which at once sealed Nestor's fate in the west. In vain did Nestor represent to Caelestine that he rejected the expression Θεοτόκος only in its false acceptation.[19] He was de-

onibus literarum, olim quidem nostra conscripta transmittens, quasi ad demonstrationem convictionum, quibus contradici non posset, tanquam ego Christum purum hominem definirem: qui certe legem inter ipsa meâe ordinationis initia contra eos, qui Christum purum hominem dicunt, et contra reliquas haereses innovavi (Cod. Theod. xvi. v. 65). Excerptiones vero intertexens sermonum conscripta composuit, ne societatis compactione detegeretur illata calumnia, et quaedam quidem allocutionibus nostris adjiciens, aliquorum vero partes abrumpens, et illa contexens, quae a nobis de dominica humanatione sunt dicta, velut de puro ea homine dixerimus, &c.

[18] In the year 430 Cassian wrote, desired by the Romish archdeacon (subsequently bishop) Leo, his libb. vii. de incarn. Christi adv. Nestorium (cf. Wiggers de Jo. Cassiano p. 28 s.), although it is probable he was acquainted with Nestor's heresy merely from that Egyptian description of it. Lib. i. c. 3. he says of a new heresy which had broken out at Bellay (Beligarum urbe), to which, according to chap. iv., Leporius also belonged: peculiare re proprium supradictae illius haereseos, quae ex Pelagiano vixisse, eo progressi sunt, ut assererent, homines, si velint, sine peccato esse posse. Consequens enim existimabant, ut si homo solitarius Jesus Christus sine peccato fuisset, omnes quoque homines sine Dei adjutorio esse possint, quicquid ille homo solitarius sine consortio Dei esse potuisset.—Unde advertit novus nunc jam, non novae haereseos auctor, qui Dominum Salvatoremque nostrum solitarium hominem natum esse contendit, idem se omnino dicere, quod Pelagianistae ante dixerunt: et consequens errori suo esse, ut qui utique sine peccato solitarium hominem Jesum Christum vixisse asserit, omnes quoque per se homines sine peccato posse esse blasphemet.—Nec dubium id est, re ipsa penitus declarante. Hinc enim illud est, quod intercessionibus suis Pelagianistarum querelas fovet, et scriptis suis causas illorum asserit, quod subtiliter his, vel, ut verius dixerim, subdole patrocinatur, et consanguineae sibi improbitati improbo suffragatur affectu, &c. Comp. § 87. not. 41. Hence Lib. v. c. 1. haeresim illam Pelagianae haereseos discipulam atque imitatricem and c. 2. to Nestor: Ergo vides, Pelagianum te virus vomere, Pelagiano te spiritu sibilare. In like manner Prosperi epitaphium Nestoriani et Pelagiani:—

> Nestoriana lues successi Pelagianae,
> Quae tamen est utero progenerata meo.
> Infelix miserae genetrix et filia natae,
> Prodivi ex ipso germine, quod peperi, &c.

[19] Nestorii epist. iii. ad Caelestin. (ap. Mansi iv. 1021. v. 725. ap. Coustant among the epp. Caelest. no. vi., vii. and xv.) From the epist. 1: Unde et nos non modicam corruptionem orthodoxiae apud quosdam hic reperientes, et ira et lenitate circa aegros quotidie utimur. Est enim aegritudo non parva, sed affinis putredini Apollinaris et Arii. Dominicam enim in homine unionem ad cujusdam contemperationis confusionem passim commiscent: adeo ut et quidam apud nos clerici,—aperte blas-

clared a heretic at synods held at *Rome* and *Alexandria* (430), and *Cyril* published 12 *anathemas*, in which he sought to establish the true doctrine of Christ's person against Nestor's heresy.[20]

phement Deum Verbum Patri homousion, tamquam originis initium de Christotoco virgine sumsisset, et cum templo suo aedificatus esset, et consepultus. Carnem dicunt post resurrectionem suam non mansisse carnem, sed in naturam transiisse deitatis.—Si quis autem hoc nomen Theotocon propter natam humanitatem conjunctam Deo Verbo, non propter parientem proponet; dicimus quidem hoc vocabulum in ea, quae peperit, non esse conveniens (oportet enim veram matrem de eadem esse essentia ac ex se natum): ferri tamen potest hoc vocabulum—eo quod solum nominetur de virgine hoc verbum propter inseparabile templum Dei Verbi ex ipsa (natum), non quia ipsa mater sit Verbi Dei: nemo enim antiquiorem se parit. From epist. iii.: Ego autem ad hanc quidem vocem, quae est Θεοτόκος, nisi secundum Apollinaris et Arii furorem ad confusionem naturarum proferatur, volentibus dicere non resisto: nec tamen ambigo, quin haec vox Θεοτόκος illi voci cedat, quae est χριστοτόκος, tamquam prolatae ab Angelis et Evangeliis.—Placuit vero, Deo adjuvante etiam synodum inexcusabiliter totius orbis terrarum indicere propter inquisitionem aliarum rerum ecclesiasticarum: nam dubitatione verborum non aestimo habituram inquisitionem difficultates, nec impedimentum esse ad tractatum divinitatis Domini Christi.

[20] With the synodical letter relating to the same in Cyrilli opp. v. iii. 67. Mansi iv. 1067. Baumgarten's theol. Streitigk. ii. 770. Cf. Salig de Eutychianismo ante Eutychen p. 324: i. Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ Θεὸν εἶναι κατὰ ἀλήθειαν τὸν Ἐμμανουὴλ, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο Θεοτόκον τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον· γεγέννηκε γὰρ σαρκικῶς σάρκα γεγονότα τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ λόγον· ἀνάθεμα ἐστω. ii. Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ, σαρκὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἡνῶσθαι τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγον, ἕνα τε εἶναι Χριστὸν μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκὸς, τὸν αὐτὸν δηλονότι Θεόν τε ὁμοῦ καὶ ἄνθρωπον, ἀ. ε. iii. Εἴ τις ἐπὶ τοῦ ἑνὸς Χριστοῦ διαιρεῖ τὰς ὑποστάσεις μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν, μόνῃ συνάπτων αὐτὰς συναφείᾳ τῇ κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν, ἤγουν αὐθεντίαν ἢ δυναστείαν, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον συνόδῳ τῇ καθ' ἕνωσιν φυσικὴν, ἀ. ε. iv. Εἴ τις προσώποις δυσὶν, ἤγουν ὑποστάσεσι, τάς τε ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελικοῖς καὶ ἀποστολικοῖς συγγράμμασι διανεμει φωνὰς, ἢ ἐπὶ Χριστῷ παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων λεγομενας, ἢ παρ' αὐτοῦ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ τὰς μὲν ὡς ἀνθρώπῳ παρὰ τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ λόγον ἰδικῶς νοουμενῳ προσάπτει, τὰς δὲ ὡς Θεοπρεπεῖς μόνῳ τῷ ἐκ Θεοῦ πατρὸς λογῳ, ἀ. ε. v. Εἴ τις τολμᾷ λεγειν Θεοφόρον ἄνθρωπον τὸν Χριστὸν, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον Θεὸν εἶναι κατὰ ἀλήθειαν, ὡς υἱὸν ἕνα καὶ φύσει, καθὸ γεγονε σὰρξ ὁ λόγος, καὶ κεκοινωνηκε παραπλησίως ἡμῖν αἵματος καὶ σαρκὸς, ἀ. ε. vi. Εἴ τις τολμᾷ λέγειν, Θεὸν ἢ δεσπότην εἶναι τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγον, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖ Θεὸν ὁμοῦ τε καὶ ἄνθρωπον, ὡς γεγονότος σαρκὸς τοῦ λόγου κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς, ἀ. ε. vii. Εἴ τίς φησιν, ὡς ἄνθρωπον ἐνεργῆσθαι παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ τὴν τοῦ μονογενοῦς εὐδοξίαν περιῆφθαι, ὡς ἕτερον παρ' αὐτὸν ὑπάρχοντα, ἀ. ἔ. viii. Εἴ τις τολμᾷ λέγειν, τὸν ἀναληφθέντα ἄνθρωπον συμπροσκυνεῖσθαι δεῖν τῷ Θεῷ λόγῳ, καὶ συνδοξάζεσθαι καὶ συγχρηματίζειν Θεὸν, ὡς ἕτερον ἑτέρῳ (τὸ γὰρ "Σὺν" ἀεὶ προστιθέμενον, τοῦτο νοεῖν ἀναγκάζει) καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον μιᾷ προσκυνήσει τιμᾷ τὸν Ἐμμανουὴλ, καὶ μίαν αὐτῷ τὴν δοξολογίαν ἀναπέμπει, καθὸ γέγονε σὰρξ ὁ λόγος, ἀ. ἔ. ix. Εἴ τίς φησι, τὸν ἕνα κύριον

These anathemas were not only answered by Nestor in as many anti-anathemas,[21] but they also excited great commotion among

Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δεδοξάσθαι παρὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, ὡς ἀλλοτρίᾳ δυνάμει τῇ δι' αὐτοῦ χρώμενον, καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ λαβόντα τὸ ἐνεργεῖν δύνασθαι κατα πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων, καὶ τὸ πληροῦν εἰς ἀνθρώπους τὰς θεοσημείας, καὶ οὐχί δὴ μᾶλλον ἴδιον αὐτοῦ τὸ πνεῦμά φησι, δι' οὗ καὶ ἐνήργησε τὰς θεοσημείας, ἀ. ἕ. x. *Ἀρχιερέα καὶ ἀπόστολον τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν γεγεννῆσθαι Χριστὸν ἡ θεία λέγει γραφὴ, προσκεκομικέναι τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἑαυτὸν εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί. εἴ τις τοίνυν ἀρχιερέα καὶ ἀπόστολον ἡμῶν γεγεννῆσθαί φησιν οὐκ αὐτὸν τὸν ἐκ θεοῦ λόγον, ὅτε γέγονε σὰρξ καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ὡς ἕτερον παρ' αὐτὸν ἰδικῶς ἄνθρωπον ἐκ γυναικός· ἢ εἴ τις λέγει, καὶ ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ προσενεγκεῖν αὐτὸν τὴν προσφορὰν, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον ὑπὲρ μόνων ἡμῶν· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐδεήθη προσφορᾶς ὁ μὴ εἰδὼς ἁμαρτίαν· ἀ. ἕ.* xi. *Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου σάρκα ζωοποιὸν εἶναι, καὶ ἰδίαν αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐκ θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγου, ἀλλ' ὡς ἑτέρου τινὸς παρ' αὐτὸν, συνημμένου μὲν αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν, ἤγουν ὡς μόνην θείαν ἐνοίκησιν ἐσχηκότος· καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον ζωοποιὸν, ὡς ἔφημεν, ὅτι γέγονεν ἰδία τοῦ λόγου τοῦ τὰ πάντα ζωογονεῖν ἰσχύοντος, ἀ. ἕ.* xii. *Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον παθόντα σαρκὶ, καὶ ἐσταυρωμένον σαρκὶ, καὶ θανάτου γευσάμενον σαρκὶ, γεγονότα τε πρωτότοκον ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καθὸ ζωή τέ ἐστι καὶ ζωοποιὸς ὡς θεὸς, ἀ. ἕ.* Cyril's own doctrine is most apparent from his second letter to Succensus (opp. v. iii. 141). The Logos became a perfect man, but continued notwithstanding unaltered, one and the same. The two natures must be distinguished only *κατὰ μόνην τὴν θεωρίαν.* P. 145: *ἔστω δὲ ἡμῖν εἰς παράδειγμα ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος. δύο μὲν γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ νοοῦμεν τὰς φύσεις, μίαν μὲν τῆς ψυχῆς, ἑτέραν δὲ τοῦ σώματος· ἀλλ' ἐν ψιλαῖς διελόντες ἐννοίαις—οὐκ ἀνὰ μέρος τίθεμεν τὰς φύσεις —ἀλλ' ἑνὸς εἶναι νοοῦμεν· ὥστε τὰς δύο μηκέτι μὲν εἶναι δύο, δι' ἀμφοῖν δὲ τὸ ἓν ἀποτελεῖσθαι ζῷον. Οὐκοῦν, κἂν εἰ λέγοιεν ἀνθρωπότητος φύσιν καὶ θεότητος ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἐμμανουὴλ, ἀλλ' ἡ ἀνθρωπότης γέγονεν ἰδία τοῦ λόγου, καὶ εἷς υἱὸς νοεῖται σὺν αὐτῇ.*

[21] Ap. Marius Mercator ed. Baluz. p. 142 ss. Baumgarten's theol. Streitigk. ii. 774. I. Si quis eum, qui est Emmanuel, Deum verbum esse dixerit, et non potius nobiscum Deum, hoc est, inhabitasse eam quae secundum nos est naturam, per id quod unitus est massae nostrae, quam de Maria virgine suscepit: matrem etiam Dei verbi, et non potius ejus, qui Emmanuel est, sanctam virginem nuncupaverit, ipsumque Deum verbum in carnem versum esse, quam accepit ad ostentationem Deitatis suae, ut habitu inveniretur ut homo, anath. sit. II. Si quis in verbi Dei conjunctione, quae ad carnem facta est, de loco in locum mutationem divinae essentiae dixerit esse factam; ejusque divinae naturae carnem capacem dixerit, ac partialiter unitam carni: aut iterum in infinitum incircumscriptae naturae coextenderit carnem ad capiendum Deum, eandemque ipsam naturam et Deum dicat et hominem, anath. sit. IV. Si quis eas voces, quae tam in evangelicis quam in epistolis apostolicis de Christo, qui est ex utraque natura, scriptae sunt, accipiat tanquam de una natura: ipsique dei verbo tentat passiones tribuere, tam secundum carnem, quam etiam deitatem, anath. sit. VI. Si quis post incarnationem Deum verbum alterum quempiam praeter Christum nominaverit; servi sane formam initium non habere a Deo Verbo, et increatam, ut

the Syrian bishops. Nestor had explained himself satisfactorily to *John*, bishop of Antioch, concerning the admissibility of the expression Θεοτόκος; while Cyril seemed entirely to do away with the distinction of natures in Christ. Hence Cyril's anathemas were universally rejected as erroneous in the cast. *Andrew*, bishop of Samosata, and *Theodoret*, bishop of Cyrus († 457),[22] wrote refutations of them.[23]

ipse est, dicere tentaverit, et non magis ab ipso creatam confiteatur, tamquam a naturali domino et creatore et Deo, quam et suscitare propria virtute promisit, Solvite, dicens, templum hoc, et in triduo suscitabo illud (Jo. ii. 19), a. s. VIII. Si quis servi formam pro se ipso, hoc est secundum propriae naturae rationem, colendam esse dixerit, et rerum omnium dominam: et non potius per societatem, qua beatae et ex se naturaliter dominicae unigeniti naturae conjuncta est, veneratur; a. s. XI. Si quis unitam carnem verbo Dei ex naturae propriae possibilitate vivificatricem esse dixerit; ipso Domino et Deo pronunciante: Spiritus est, qui vivificat, caro nihil prodest (Jo. vi. 64); anath. sit. Spiritus est Deus, a Domino pronunciatum est. Si quis ergo Deum Verbum carnaliter secundum substantiam carnem factum esse dicat (hoc autem modo et specialiter custodite: maxime Domino Christo post resurrectionem suam discipulis suis dicente: Palpate et videte, quia spiritus ossa et carnem non habet, sicut me videtis habere, Luc. xxiv. 39); a. s.

[22] His works: valuable commentaries, especially on the Epistles of Paul (J. F. Chr. Richter de Theodoreto epist. Paulin. interprete comm. Lips. 1822. 8). Historical writings, Hist. eccl. libb. 5. Φιλόθεος ἱστορία s. historia religiosa. Haereticarum fabularum libb. 5. Polemic: Ἐρανιστὴς ἤτοι Πολύμορφος libb. iv. Ἑλληνικῶν θεραπευτικὴ παθημάτων disputt. xii. (ad codd. mss. rec. Thom. Gaisford. Oxon. 1839. 8). Epistles —Opp. ed. Jac. Sirmond. Paris 1642 voll. iv. fol. v. s. auctarium add. Joh. Garnier. Paris 1684. ed J. L. Schulze et J. A. Noesselt. Halae 1769—1774. T. v. 8.

[23] That of Andrew in Latin ap. Mercator p. 220 ss. Greek fragments in Cyrilli apologeticus.—That of Theodoret see in his works opp. ed. Schulze, T. v. p. 1 ss. In the latter we read: Ad. i. Ἡμεῖς δὲ—οὐ σάρκα φύσει γεγονέναι, οὐδὲ εἰς σάρκα μεταβληθῆναι τὸν θεὸν λόγον φαμέν.—ἀλλ' ἀνέλαβε σάρκα καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν,—οὐκ αὐτὸς φύσει ἐκ τῆς παρθένου γεγέννηται συλληφθείς, καὶ διαπλασθείς,—ἀλλ' ἑαυτῷ ναὸν ἐν τῇ παρθενικῇ γαστρὶ διαπλάσας, συνῆν τῷ πλασθέντι καὶ γεννηθέντι· οὗ χάρι καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν ἐκείνην παρθένον θεοτόκον προσαγορεύομεν, οὐχ ὡς θεὸν φύσει γεννήσασαν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄνθρωπον, τῷ διαπλάσαντι αὐτὸν, ἠνωμένον θεῷ. Ad. ii.—τὴν καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἕνωσιν παντάπασιν ἀγνοῦμεν, ὡς ξένην.—εἰ δὲ τοῦτο βούλεται λέγειν διὰ τῆς καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἑνώσεως ὁ ταῦτα γεννήσας, ὡς κράσις σαρκὸς καὶ θεότητος γέγονεν, ἀντεροῦμεν συν πάσῃ προθυμίᾳ καὶ τὴν βλασφημίαν ἐλέγξομεν. Ad. iii.—συνάφεια καὶ σύνοδος οὐδενὶ διαφέρουσιν.—ἓν μὲν πρόσωπον καὶ ἕνα υἱὸν καὶ Χριστὸν ὁμολογεῖν εὐσεβές· δύο δὲ τὰς ἐνωθείσας ὑποστάσεις, εἴτουν φύσεις λέγειν, οὐκ ἄτοπον, ἀλλὰ κατ' αἰτίαν ἀκόλουθον. Ad. iv.—τὰ μὲν θεοπρεπῶς εἰρημένα καὶ πεπραγμένα τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ προσαψομεν· τὰ δὲ ταπεινῶς εἰρημένα καὶ πεπραγμένα δούλου μορφῇ προσαρμόσομεν. Ad. v.—τὸν θεοφόρον ἄνθρω-

Under these circumstances Theodosius II. called *a general council* at *Ephesus*, (431).[24] Cyril hastened hither with a numerous band of adherents. The bold remonstrances of the honest *Isidore*, abbot of Pelusium, († 440)[25] had no effect upon him;[26] but listening only to the promptings of revenge he proceeded to condemn Nestor without waiting for the arrival of the eastern bishops.[27] When they arrived, however, they assembled with

πον, ὡς πολλοῖς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων εἰρημένον, οὐ παραιτούμεθα'—καλοῦμεν δὲ Θεοφόρον ἄνθρωπον, οὐχ ὡς μερικήν τινα θείαν χάριν δεξάμενον, ἀλλ' ὡς πᾶσαν ἡνωμένην ἔχοντα τοῦ υἱοῦ τὴν θεότητα. Ad. xii.—ἔπαθε ἡ τοῦ δούλου μορφὴ, συνούσης αὐτῇ δηλονότι τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ μορφῆς,—οἰκειουμένης δὲ διὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν τὰ παθήματα. From Cyril's apology in answer to Theodoret. Ad. i.—εἰ λέγοιμεν σάρκα γενέσθαι τὸν λόγον, οὐ σύγχυσιν, οὐ φυρμὸν, οὐ τροπὴν, οὐκ ἀλλοίωσιν συμβῆναι περὶ αὐτὸν φαμέν· ἡνῶσθαι δὲ μᾶλλον ἀφράστως καὶ ἀποῤῥήτως σώματι ψυχὴν ἔχοντι νοεράν. Ad. iii.—ἄνθρωπον συνῆφθαι θεῷ σχετικῶς, διατείνονται, κατὰ μόνην τὴν ἀξίαν, ἤγουν αὐθεντίαν, καὶ κατὰ τὴν τῆς υἱότητος ὁμωνυμίαν.—κατὰ φύσιν, τοῦτ' ἔστιν, οὐ σχετικῶς, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν. Theodoret wrote besides pentalogium s. libb. v. incarnationi verbi adv. Cyrillum et Patres Conc. Ephesini (Fragments ap. Mercator).

[24] On the history of it, see Salig de Eutychianismo ante Eutychen p. 234. Fuchs Bibliothek d. Kirchenversamml. des 4ten u. 5ten Jahrh. iv. 1.

[25] Isid. Pelus. epistolarum libb. iv. ed. Conr. Rittershusius. Heidelb. 1605. fol. Epistt. hactenus ineditae ed. ab A. Schotto. Antv. 1623. 8. and Francof. 1629. fol. Editions of all together: Isid. Pelus. de interpretatione divinae scripturae epistolarum libb. v. Paris 1638 (incorrect). Venet. 1745. fol. Cf. H. A. Niemeyer de Isidori Pelusiotae vita, scriptis et doctrina. Halae 1825. 8. Thirteen letters in an old Latin version have put into the Synodicon as bearing on this controversy (prim. ed. Mansi v. p. 758). See the originals, lib. i. ep. 25, 102, 310, 311, 323, 324, 370, 404, 405, 419. iv. 166, 211. v. 268.

[26] Lib. i. ep. 310 (Latin in the Synodicon, l. c.): Προσπάθεια μὲν οὐκ ὀξυδορκεῖ, ἀντιπάθεια δὲ ὅλως οὐχ ὁρᾷ. εἰ τοίνυν ἑκατέρας λήμης βούλει καθαρεῦσαι, μὴ βιαίας ἀποφάσεις ἐκβίβαζε, ἀλλὰ κρίσει δικαίᾳ τὰς αἰτίας ἐπίτρεψον. Πολλοί γάρ σε κωμῳδοῦσι τῶν συνειλεγμένων εἰς Ἔφεσον, ὡς οἰκείαν ἀμυνόμενον ἔχθραν, ἀλλ' οὐ τὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὀρθοδόξως ζητοῦντα. ἀδελφιδοῦς ἐστί, φασι, Θεοφίλου, μιμούμενος ἐκείνου τὴν γνώμην· ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος μανίαν σαφῆ κατεσκέδασε τοῦ Θεοφόρου καὶ Θεοφιλοῦς Ἰωάννου, οὕτως ἐπιθυμεῖ καυχήσασθαι καὶ οὗτος, εἰ καὶ πολὺ τῶν κρινομένων ἐστὶ τὸ διάφορον. Cf. lib. i. ep. 370. Concerning Isidore's own doctrine see Niemeyer l. c. p. 173 ss. 22 s. Vater in the kirchenhist. Archiv. 1825. S. 248 ff.

[27] The sentence may be seen in Mansi iv. 1212: Ὁ βλασφημηθεὶς τοίνυν παῤ αὐτοῦ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὥρισε διὰ τῆς παρούσης ἁγιωτάτης συνόδου, ἀλλότριον εἶναι τὸν αὐτὸν Νεστόριον τοῦ ἐπισκοπικοῦ ἀξιώματος, καὶ παντὸς συλλόγου ἱερατικοῦ. The Egyptian party (comp. the decisions p. 1139 ss.) thought they had in their favour the express words of the Nicene creed, namely, θεὸν—ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, παθόντα, &c. Subsequently the adherents of Caelestius and Pelagius were often confounded with

John at their head, and deposed Cyril and his principal assistant *Memnon*, bishop of *Ephesus*. The weak Theodosius had been incensed at Cyril till now, but the latter not only contrived to bring over to his side the impetuous monks at Constantinople,[28] but also to make many friends at court by bribes and other artifices. The emperor at first confirmed the three depositions; but was afterwards prevailed on to re-instate Cyril and Memnon in their offices. Nestor on the other hand was obliged to withdraw into his former cloister at Antioch.

The consequence of these measures was a division between the east and the other provinces, especially Egypt. The Orientals, however, were not sufficiently united to withstand their opponents, backed as the latter were by the court. *Rabulas*, bishop of Edessa, went over to Cyril's party, and even began to show his zeal both by attacking the writings of *Theodore of Mopsuestia*, so much valued in the east, and the proper sources of Nestor's error. Even *John* made peace with Cyril (433). The latter accommodated

those of Nestorius, and condemned without express notification of their doctrine. See Mansi iv. 1320. 1328. 1334. 1338. 1472. 1474.

[28] From the epistle of Epiphanius archdeacon of Cyril, to Maximinian the new bishop of Constantinople (Mansi v. 987. Theodoreti opp. ed. Schulze v. 869.), it is clear that many presents were sent from Alexandria (εὐλογίαι) to the empress, her ladies, and influential courtiers. Clerici, qui hic sunt, contristantur, quod Ecclesia Alexandrina nudata sit hujus causa turbelae, et debet praeter illa, quae hinc transmissa sunt, Ammonio Comiti auri libras mille quingentas.

[29] See Mansi v. 305 (it was the creed put forth by Theodoret in Ephesus, and presented to the emperor by the Oriental party. Synodicon c. 17 ap. Mansi v. 783, comp. Alexandri epist. ad Theodoret. in Synod. c. 96, ibid. p. 878): Ὁμολογοῦμεν τοιγαροῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν μονογενῆ, Θεὸν τέλειον καὶ ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος· πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν Θεότητα, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι' ἡμᾶς, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα· ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν Θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα· δύο γὰρ φύσεων ἕνωσις γέγονε· διὸ ἕνα Χριστὸν, ἕνα υἱὸν, ἕνα κύριον ὁμολογοῦμεν. Κατὰ ταύτην τὴν τῆς ἀσυγχύτου ἑνώσεως ἔννοιαν ὁμολογοῦμεν τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον Θεοτόκον, διὰ τὸ τὸν Θεὸν λόγον σαρκωθῆναι καὶ ἐνανθρωπῆσαι, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς συλλήψεως ἑνῶσαι ἑαυτῷ τὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς ληφθέντα ναόν· τὰς δὲ εὐαγγελικὰς καὶ ἀποστολικὰς περὶ τοῦ κυρίου φωνὰς, ἴσμεν τοὺς θεολόγους ἄνδρας, τὰς μὲν κοινοποιοῦντας, ὡς ἐφ' ἑνὸς προσώπου, τὰς δὲ διαιροῦντας, ὡς ἐπὶ δύο φύσεων· καὶ τὰς μὲν θεοπρεπεῖς κατὰ τὴν Θεότητα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὰς δὲ ταπεινὰς κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα αὐτοῦ παραδιδόντας. Many Egyptians were dissatisfied with this formula, Liberatus breviar. c. 8, culpaverunt Cyrillum, cur susceperit ab orientalibus Episcopis duarum confessionem naturarum, quod Nestorius dixit et docuit. To this must be referred

himself so far as to subscribe a confession of faith belonging to Antioch;[29] the former sacrificed his friend Nestor. The unfor-

Isidori lib. i. ep. 324, ad Cyrillum, because the latter has been taken into the Synodicon (Mansi v. 759): Χρή σε, θαυμάσιε, ἄτρεπτον μένειν ἀεί, οὔτε φόβῳ προδιδόντα τὰ οὐράνια, οὔτε σαυτῷ ἐναντίον φαινόμενον. εἰ γὰρ τὰ νῦν γεγραμμένα σοι τοῖς προτέροις ἀντεξετάσειας, ἢ κολακείας φανήσῃ ὑπεύθυνος, εὐχερείας ἢ διάκονος, κενῆς μὲν δόξης ἠττώμενος, τῶν μεγάλων δὲ ἁγίων ἀθλητῶν τοὺς ἀγῶνας οὐ μιμησάμενος, οἳ τὸν ἅπαντα βίον ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίας κακουχεῖσθαι ὑπέμειναν, ἢ κακόδοξον φρόνημα κἂν μέχρις ὥτων εἰσδέξασθαι. Against such charges Cyril defends himself at greatest length in the epist. ad Acacium Episc. Melitenae (opp. v. iii. 105. Mansi v. 310): besides in epist. ad Eulogium Presb. Constantinop. (opp. v. iii. 123), ad Rufum Ep. Thessalonic. and ad Maximum Diac. Antioch. (in Maji scriptt. vet. nova coll. viii. ii. 138). In the two latter he confesses he had accommodated himself to the prevailing notions. The orientals accordingly perceived in the adoption of that confession of faith a retractation on the part of Cyril. See Ibae epist. ad Marin in Actis Conc. Chalc. act. x. Mansi vii. 247, especially Theodoreti ep. ad Joannem Episc. Antioch A.D. 433 (ep. 171 in Theod. opp. ed. Schulze iv. 1354, a complete copy in Latin in Synodico l. c. v. 747): Ἐν κοινῷ ἀναγνόντες τὰ Αἰγύπτια γράμματα, καὶ ἐξετάσαντες αὐτῶν ἀκριβῶς τὴν διάνοιαν, εὕρομεν σύμφωνα τοῖς εἰρημένοις (ὑφ' ἡμῶν) τὰ ἐκεῖθεν ἀπεσταλμένα, καὶ ἄντικρυς ἐναντία τοῖς δώδεκα κεφαλαίοις, οἷς μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος, ὡς ἀλλοτρίοις τῆς εὐσεβείας, πολεμοῦντες διετελέσαμεν. Ἐκεῖνα μὲν γὰρ εἶχε, σαρκικῶς σάρκα γεγονότα τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Λόγον κ. τ. λ. ἀπηγόρευσε δὲ καὶ τῶν περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου φωνῶν τὴν διαίρεσιν. Τὰ δὲ νῦν ἀπεσταλμένα τῇ εὐαγγελικῇ εὐγενείᾳ καλύνεται· Θεὸς γὰρ τέλειος καὶ ἄνθρωπος τέλειος ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χρ. ἀναδείκνυται ἐν αὐτοῖς· καὶ φύσεις δύο, καὶ τούτων διαφορά, καὶ ἕνωσις ἀσυγχύτως— καὶ τῶν φύσεων τὰς ἰδιότητας ἀκρατῶς διαφυλάξασα· καὶ ἀπαθὴς μὲν ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος, καὶ ἄτρεπτος, παθητὸς δὲ ὁ ναός κ. τ. λ. Altera vero diffamata sunt quaedam, quae nos nimium turbaverunt. Dicunt enim, quod is, qui hic poenitudine usus sit, non solum dejectionis s. damnationis subscriptionem a vestra Sanctitate nitatur exigere, sed anathematismum quoque doctrinae sanctissimi et Deo amicissimi episcopi Nestorii. Quodsi id verum est—simile aliquid facit, tanquam si quis vix tandem perductus ad consubstantialem Deo et Patri Filium confitendum, mox iterum anathemate feriat eos, qui hoc a principio sapuerunt atque docuerunt, &c. Cyril himself says, Cyrillus ad Acacium ap. Mansi v. 314, 315, that even the Nestorians considered that confession as consonant with their faith. It is certain that Alexander, bishop of Hierapolis, the most violent opponent of Cyril, was also against that confession, because it had adopted the expression Θεοτόκος (ep. ad Theodoret ap. Mansi v. 878. Schulze v. 750: quia hoc est quasi arx totius ejus haereseos); but he does not reject it absolutely, but merely expresses his disapprobation of the doctrinal use of it under existing circumstances (Mansi v. 875. Schulze v. 746: post corruptionem totius orbis, et ex quo praedicari nunc coepit passibilis Deus ab impiis Cyrilli capitulis, dogmatice poni solam vocem—theotocon, absque illa—anthropotocon, nihil est aliud, nisi ea quae Cyrilli sunt praedicari). Even the later Monophysites accused Cyril of apostatising from his doctrine. See Timothei Aeluri fragm. ap. Mansi vii.

tunate Nestor, who had never asserted aught inconsistent with that very confession of faith now signed by Cyril, was first banished to Oasis; then in Thebais was dragged from one place of banishment to another, till his death in 440.[30] To justify his condemnation, his contemporaries were obliged to misrepresent his doctrinal system,[31] and it was so handed down to posterity, till men of more enlarged and clearer views discovered the truth.[32]

The Syrian bishops were now compelled to assent to the peace concluded between John and Cyril. The greatest opposition was made by *the theological school in Edessa*, which had long been the place of education for the Persian clergy, when Rabulas prohibited the writings of Diodorus and Theodore. Several of the teachers were interdicted, and betook themselves to Persia. One of them, *Barsumas* (Barsauma) was bishop of Nisibis (435—489) and confirmed the Persian Christians in their attachment to the doctrinal system of Theodore, and their aversion to the council of Cyril at Ephesus. The successor of Rabulas in Edessa, *Ibas*, (bishop from 436 to 457) was indeed,

841 and Maji coll. nov. vii. 1, 138, which fragment, if not belonging to Timothy (as Walch Ketzerhist. vi. 682 shows), proceeded at least from a Monophysite. Hence when Vater (kirchenhist. Archiv. 1825, ii. 211) and Baur (Dreieinigkeit i. 786) deny the inconsistency of Cyril, they have at least the universal voice of that period against them.

[30] See Nestor's own account ap. Evagrius i. 7.

[31] Ex. gr. Cassianus above not. 18. Leo in epist. ad Leonem Aug. (Quesn. 135, Baller. 165): Anathematizetur ergo Nestorius, qui beatam virginem Mariam non Dei, sed hominis tantummodo credidit genitri cem, ut aliam personam carnis faceret, aliam deitatis: nec unum Christum in Verbo Dei et carne sentiret, sed separatim atque sejunctim alterum filium Dei, alterum hominis praedicaret. Still more misrepresented is the appendix to Augustin. de haeresibus c. 91: Nestoriani a Nestorio episcopo, qui contra catholicam fidem dogmatizare ausus est, Dominum nostrum J. C. hominem tantum: nec id, quod mediator Dei et hominum effectum est, in utero virginis de Spiritu S. fuisse conceptum, sed postea Deum homini fuisse permixtum, &c. Such were the sources from which the middle ages drew their ideas of Nestorianism.

[32] First Luther (respecting councils in Walch's Ausg. Th. xvi. S. 2718). After him many others (P. Bayle, S. and J. Basnage, Christ. Kortholt, also Rich. Simon, L. Ell. du Pin, L. Maraccius, and others) reckoned it to be a mere dispute of words. So also P. E. Jablonski de Nestorianismo. Berol. 1724. 8., and Chr. A. Salig de Eutychianismo ante Eutychen. Guelpherb. 1723. 4. p. 284, 307. Controversial writings against Jablonski by P. Berger, J. Wessel, and especially C. G. Hoffmann, may be seen in Walchii bibl. theol. iii. 773. Comp. J. Vogt de recentissimis Nestorii defensoribus in the bibl. haeresiol. i. iii. 456.

though at peace with Cyril, a zealous friend of the views of the Antiochenian school, and even translated *Theodore's* works into Syriac; but persecution was afterwards renewed against the adherents of these principles; the school of Edessa was destroyed (489); and its few remaining friends fled into Persia. The Persian church had now broken off all connection with the church of the Roman empire, and the kings of Persia from *Pherozes* onward (461—488) favoured this separation for political reasons. These Christians, who had the bishop of *Seleucia* and *Ctesiphon*, were called by their opponents *Nestorians*, though they called themselves *Chaldaean Christians*, and in India *Thomas-Christians*. They have not only diffused themselves extensively in Asia, but have also acquired great merit by conveying much of the learning of Greece into that part of the world, as well as by founding schools and hospitals. At a later period they became the instructors of the Arabians.[33]

§ 89.

EUTYCHIAN CONTROVERSY.

Sources: Breviculus historiae Eutychianistarum s. gesta de nomine Acacii[1] reaching to the year 486, according to the conjecture of Ballerinus, by Pope Gelasius, (ap. Mansi vii. 1060).—Liberati breviarium and the last pieces of the Synodicon (see notices prefixed to § 88).—Evagrius i. c. 9 ss.—Collection of Acts of councils, ap. Mansi vi. and vii.

Walch's Ketzerhistorie vi. 1—640. Wundemann's Gesch. d. Glaubenslehre ii. 305. Münscher's Dogmengesch. iv. 79. Neander's Kirchengesch. ii. iii. 1073. Baur's Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit u. Menschwerdung Gottes i. 800.

Notwithstanding the external union between *Cyril* and *John*, the internal schism between Egypt (which Palestine followed) and the east, as to the person of Christ, still continued. The Egyptians perceived Nestorianism[2] in the doctrine of two

[33] The leading work is: Jos. Sim. Assemanus de Syris Nestorianis (bibliothecae orient. T. iii. P. ii. Rom. 1728. fol.) Ebedjesu (a Nestorian metropolitan of Soba or Nisibis † 1318) liber Margaritae de veritate fidei (in Ang. Maji scriptt. vett. nova coll. x. ii. 317) is a discussion or justification of the Nestorian faith.

[1] Concerning the three editions of this Breviculus, see Ballerini de antt. collection. cann. P. ii. c. 12 (in Gallandii sylloge ed. Mogont. T. i. p. 457), and Walch's Ketzerhistorie Th. 6. S. 23 f. and 891 f.

[2] Notwithstanding his subscription of the Antiochenian symbol, Cyril

natures; while the orientals, in the doctrine of one nature discovered Apollinarianism.[3] The former party however continued to be favoured by the court; and of this favour Cyril's successor, the violent *Dioscurus* (bishop from 444 till 451) availed himself extensively for the purpose of putting down the most zealous oriental bishops as Nestorians, and of forcing the Egyptian doctrines on the east.[4]

still held fast the Athanasian formula: *μίαν φύσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένην.* Cf. epistolae ii. ad Successum. opp. v. ii. 137 and 143. Acacii epist. ad Cyrillum in the Synodicon (Mansi v. 860 and 998, and in Theodoreti opp. ed. Schulze v. 730 and 880): cogatur unusquisque publice anathematizare Nestorii et Theodori dogmata, praecipue hos, qui dicunt duas naturas post unitionem, proprie unamquamque operantem. A copious declaration in Acacii epist. ad Successum (in the Synod. Mansi v. 999. Schulze v. 881). Ex. gr.: videmus, quod is qui ex Deo patre est sermo, inhumanatus est et incarnatus, et non sibi ex divina natura sanctum illud corpus plasmavit, sed magis ex virgine id accepit. Alioquin quomodo factus est homo, nisi quia corpus portavit humanum? Advertentes igitur, ut dixi. inhumanationis modum, videmus, quia duae naturae ad invicem convenerunt unitione indisrumpibili, inconfuse atque inconvertibiliter. Et ex duabus naturis factum fuisse dicentes, veruntamen post unitionem non dividimus naturas ab invicem, nec in duos incidimus Christum, sed unum asserimus filium, et ut patres dixerunt, unam naturam verbi incarnatam. Ergo factus est homo, non hominem recepit, ut videtur Nestorio. Eranistes in Theodoreti dial. ii. (ed. Schulze iv. 83) says: *τὸ δέ γε ἄνθρωπον ἀποκαλεῖν τῆς οἰκουμένης τὸν σωτῆρα, σμικρύνειν ἐστὶ τοῦ δεσπότου τὴν δόξαν.* p. 106 and 114: *ὁ δύο λέγων φύσεις δύο λέγει υἱούς.* p. 114: *Ἐγὼ τὴν θεότητα λέγω μεμενηκέναι, καταποθῆναι δὲ ὑπὸ ταύτης τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, ὡς ἡ θάλασσα μέλιτος προσλαβοῦσα σταγόνα. Φροῦδος γὰρ εὐθὺς ἡ σταγὼν ἐκείνη γίνεται, τῷ τῆς θαλάττης ὕδατι μιγνυμένη* (the same figure in Gregor. Nyss. antirrhet. adv. Apollinar. § 42. Münscher's Dogmengesch. Bd. 4. S. 37). Some went still farther. See Isidor. Pelus. lib. i. epist. 496, ad Constantinum: *Οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ζῆλός σου κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν. τοὺς τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβῶς προσβεύοντας διώκεις ἐμμανῶς, σύγχυσίν τινα καὶ ἀνάκρασιν καὶ τροπὴν τὴν εἰς σάρκα τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου κατηχῶν, ἢ ἀλλοιῶν τὴν θείαν φύσιν εἰς σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα, ἢ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ἀθετῶν.* Cf. epist. 419.

[3] About this time Theodoret wrote against the Egyptians his apologia pro Diodoro et Theodoro Mopsvest., now lost, and Eranistes (ed. Schulze T. iv. p. 1 ss.)

[4] Deposition of Irenaeus, bishop of Tyre (Theodosii ii. lex ap. Mansi v. 417, and Theodoreti epist. 110), persecution of Ibas (Liberati breviar. c. 10), and of Theodoret (Theodoreti epist. 79 ss.) Theodoreti epist. 101: *πάντων ὁμοῦ τῶν τῆς ἀνατολῆς θεοφιλεστάτων ἐπισκόπων κατέχεαν τὴν λοιδορίαν οἱ τοῦ ψεύδους ἐργάται, καὶ τὰς ἐκκλησίας ζάλης ἐνέπλησαν.* Epist. 95 ad Antioch. Praefectum: *ἐπαμυνάτω τοίνυν αὐτοῖς (τοῖς ἐπισκόποις) τὸ ὑμέτερον μέγεθος, καὶ τῆς συκοφαντουμένης ἐφ' ἃς κηδόμενον, καὶ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς προμηθούμενον πίστεως.*

On the other hand, a zealous adherent of Cyril, the old Archimandrite (abbot) *Eutyches* in Constantinople[5] was accused of holding these very doctrines, and condemned at a *σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα* by his bishop *Flavian* (448).[6] *Leo*, bishop of Rome, not only

[5] He appears as an assistant of Cyril against Nestorius in Epiphanii epist. ad Maximianum above § 88, not. 28.

[6] The acts of this synod are in the acts of the council of Chalcedon actio i. ap. Mansi vi. 649 ss. Eutyches complains, p. 700, that he has been accused of saying, *ὅτι γε δὴ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ τὴν σάρκα ὁ Θεὸς λόγος κατενήνοχεν, ὡς αὐτὸς ἀνεύθυνος τυγχάνει τῆς τοιαύτης λοιδορίας.* To the question p. 741: *Ὁμολογεῖς ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιον τῇ μητρὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα τὸν αὐτὸν ἕνα υἱὸν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.* He answers: *Ἐπειδὴ ὁμολογῶ θεόν μου, καὶ κύριον οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ἕως σήμερον φυσιολογεῖν ἐμαυτῷ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω. ὁμοούσιον δὲ ἡμῖν ἕως νῦν οὐκ εἶπον πρὸ τούτου, ὁμολογῶ. ἕως σήμερον οὐκ εἶπον τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν, τὴν δὲ ἁγίαν παρθένον ὁμολογῶ εἶναι ἡμῖν ὁμοούσιον, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐσαρκώθη ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν.* When the remark was made upon this: *τῆς μητρὸς ὁμοουσίου ἡμῖν οὔσης, πάντως καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁμοούσιος ἡμῖν ἐστιν,* he rejoined: *ἕως σήμερον οὐκ εἶπον· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ σῶμα θεοῦ αὐτὸ ὁμολογῶ, (προσέσχες), οὐκ εἶπον σῶμα ἀνθρώπου τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ σῶμα, ἀνθρώπινον δὲ τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ὅτι ἐκ τῆς παρθένου ἐσαρκώθη ὁ κύριος. εἰ δέ δεῖ εἰπεῖν ἐκ τῆς παρθένου, καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν, καὶ τοῦτο λέγω, κύριε.* To the question, p. 744: *Ὁμοούσιον, καὶ ἐκ δύο φύσεων μετὰ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐκ τῆς παρθένου λέγεις ἢ οὔ,* he gave the reply in explanation: *Ὁμολογῶ ἐκ δύο φύσεων γεγεννῆσθαι τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν πρὸ τῆς ἐνώσεως· μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἕνωσιν, μίαν φύσιν ὁμολογῶ.* When he refused to acknowledge the two natures, and to anathematise the contrary opinion, the decision was passed, p. 748: *Διὰ πάντων πεφώραται Εὐτυχὴς ὁ πάλαι πρεσβύτερος καὶ ἀρχιμανδρίτης—τὴν Οὐαλεντίνου καὶ Ἀπολιναρίου κακοδοξίαν νοσῶν. θεν ἐπιδακρύσαντες, καὶ στενάξαντες ἐπὶ τῇ παντελεῖ ἀπωλείᾳ αὐτοῦ, ὡρίσαμεν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ βλασφημηθέντος, ἀλλότριον αὐτὸν εἶναι παντὸς ἱερατικοῦ τάγματος, καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς κοινωνίας, καὶ τοῦ προεστάναι μοναστηρίου.* Comp. epist. Eutychetis ad Leonem Papam (in the Synodicon ap. Mansi v. 1015. Schulze v. 897): expetebar duas naturas fateri, et anathematizare eos, qui hoc negarent. Ego autem metuens definitionem a synodo, nec adimere nec addere verbum contra expositam fidem a sancta synodo Nicaena (cf. § 88, not. 27), sciens vero sanctos et beatos patres nostros Julium, Felicem, Athanasium, Gregorium sanctissimos episcopos refutantes duarum naturarum vocabulum, &c. In the confession of faith annexed (ibid. c. 223): Ipse enim, qui est verbum Dei, descendit de coelo sine carne, et factus est caro in utero sanctae virgini ex ipsa carne virginis incommutabiliter et inconvertibiliter, sicut ipse novit et voluit. Et factus est, qui est semper Deus perfectus ante saecula, idem et homo perfectus in extremo dierum propter nos et nostram salutem. None but opponents have charged Eutychianism with the doctrine of an apparent body, or the transformation of the Logos into flesh. So Theodoret. haer. fab. comp. iv. 13. Gelasius de duabus naturis in Christo adv. Eutychem et Nestorium. Eutyches is defended by the Jesuit Gabriel Vasquez (commentarii in Thomam. Ingolst. 1606.

approved of this proceeding, but in his epistola ad Flavianum[7]

fol. in part. iii. Thomae disp. xiv. c. 1), Archibald Bower (history of the Popes, vol. ii. p. 31, 61 ss.) and others.

[7] Ed. Quesnell. ep. 24, ed. Baller. ep. 28, c. 2, ap. Mansi v. 1359: Fecunditatem virgini Spiritus S. dedit, veritas autem corporis sumta de corpore est; et aedificante sibi sapientia domum (Prov. ix. 1) Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis: hoc est, in ea carne, quam assumsit ex homine, et quam spiritu vitae rationalis animavit. C. 3: Salva igitur proprietate utriusque naturae et substantiae, et in unam coeunte personam, suscepta est a majestate humilitas, a virtute infirmitas, ab aeternitate mortalitas: et ad resolvendum conditionis nostrae debitum natura inviolabilis naturae est unita passibili: ut, quod nostris remediis congruebat, unus atque idem mediator Dei et hominum, homo Jesus Christus, et mori posset ex uno, et mori non posset ex altero. In integra ergo veri hominis perfectaque natura verus natus est Deus, totus in suis, totus in nostris. Assumsit formam servi sine sorde peccati, humana augens, divina non minuens. Tenet enim sine defectu proprietatem suam utraque natura: et sicut formam servi Dei forma non adimit, ita formam Dei servi forma non minuit. C. 4: Nova autem nativitate generatus: quia inviolata virginitas, quae concupiscentiam nescivit, carnis materiam ministravit. Assumta est de matre Domini natura, non culpa: nec in Domino Jesu Christo, ex utero virginis genito, quia nativitas est mirabilis, ideo nostri est natura dissimilis. Qui enim verus est Deus, idem verus est homo: et nullum est in hac unitate mendacium, dum invicem sunt et humilitas hominis et altitudo Deitatis. Sicut enim Deus non mutatur miseratione, ita homo non consumitur dignitate. Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium est: Verbo scilicet operante, quod Verbi est, et carne exequente quod carnis est. Unum horum coruscat miraculis, aliud succumbit injuriis. Et sicut Verbum ab aequalitate paternae gloriae non recedit, ita caro naturam nostri generis non relinquit. Unus enim idemque est, quod saepe dicendum est, vere Dei filius et vere hominis filius. Quem itaque sicut hominem diabolica tentat astutia, eidem sicut Deo angelica famulantur officia. Esurire, sitire, lassescere, atque dormire evidenter humanum est. Sed v. panibus v. millia hominum satiare, et largiri Samaritanae aquam vivam, cujus haustus bibenti praestet, ne ultra jam sitiat; supra dorsum maris plantis non desidentibus ambulare, et elationes fluctuum increpata tempestate consternere: sine ambiguitate divinum est. Sicut ergo, ut multa praeteream, non ejusdem naturae est, flere miserationis affectu amicum mortuum, et eundem remoto quatriduanae aggere sepulturae, ad vocis imperium excitare redivivum: ita non ejusdem naturae est, dicere: Ego et Pater unum sumus (Jo. x. 30) et dicere: Pater major me est (Jo. xiv. 28). Leo here proceeded a little farther on the same path as Ambrose and Augustine. See above § 88, not. 8 and 9. J. J. Griesbach diss. locos communes theologicos, collectos ex Leone M. sistens. Halae 1768. Sect. iii. (in ejusd. opusc. acad. ed. Gabler i. 45). Epistolam etc. ed. H. Ph. C. Henke. Helmst. (The prologue is also in Henke opusc. acad. Lips. 1802. p. 59 ss.) Henke properly calls attention to the circumstance that there is no mention whatever of Nestor in the letter. Baur's Dreieinigkeit i. 809.

gave also a doctrinal development of the disputed point, which was by no means favourable to the Egyptians. It is true that Dioscurus now procured the summoning of a *general synod at Ephesus* (449) and there as president, compelled by violent measures the bishops to pronounce in favour of Eutyches and the Egyptian doctrines (*σύνοδος ληστρική, Theophanis Chronograph.* p. 86.—Latrocinium Ephesinum, Leo ad Pulcheriam ep. 75. ed. Quesnel);[8] but the death of Theodosius II. († 450) altered at once the state of affairs. The new rulers *Pulcheria*, and *Marcian*, who was elevated to the throne by marrying her, were as partial to Leo as they were hostile to Dioscurus.[9] Hence, a new *general council* was called at *Chalcedon* (451), at which Dioscurus was deposed for many misdeeds, the persecuted eastern bishops, and with them Cyril too,[10] for the purpose of sparing the Egyptians, were declared orthodox, Leo's *epist. ad Flavianum*, made the rule of faith on the point in dispute, and at the same time a more minute explanation of it given on the part of the council.[11] But though the decrees of the synod received imperial

[8] Lewald die sogen. Räubersynode, in Illgen's Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol. viii. 139.

[9] The Alexandrian Sophronius even accused Dioscurus in Chalcedon of having opposed the acknowledgment of Marcian in Egypt (Mansi vi. 1033), *ἑαυτὸν γὰρ μᾶλλον βασιλεύειν ἤθελε τῆς Αἰγυπτιακῆς διοικήσεως.* No notice, however, was taken of this accusation by the synod, nor is there a trace of it to be found elsewhere.

[10] How little convinced the prevailing party was of Cyril's orthodoxy is clear from the fact that Gennadius, patriarch of Constantinople after 458, wrote against his 12 anathemas. See Facundus pro defens. iii. capitulorum ii. 4. Salig de Eutychianismo ante Eutychen p. 316.

[11] Concerning the remarkable circumstances, and the opposition of the Roman legates, see the protocol actio v. ap. Mansi vii. 97 ss.—p. 108: *Ὅρος τῆς ἐν Χαλκηδόνι τετάρτης Συνόδου.* p. 116: *Ἑπόμενοι τοίνυν τοῖς ἁγίοις πατράσιν, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖν υἱὸν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν συμφώνως ἅπαντες ἐκδιδάσκομεν, τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι, θεὸν ἀληθῶς καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἀληθῶς τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιον τὸν αὐτὸν ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας· πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν, δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν, ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου τῆς θεοτόκου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστὸν, υἱὸν, κύριον, μονογενῆ, ἐκ δύο φύσεων* (leg. *ἐν δύο φύσεσι*) *ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον· οὐδαμοῦ τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνηρημένης διὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν, σωζομένης δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ἰδιότητος ἑκατέρας φύσεως καὶ εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον, καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης, οὐκ εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον, ἢ διαιρούμενον, ἀλλ' ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν υἱὸν καὶ μονογενῆ, θεὸν λόγον, κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν· καθάπερ ἄνωθεν οἱ προφῆται περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ*

confirmation and support by punitory laws, they were looked upon as Nestorian by many in Egypt and Palestine, and this proved soon after the beginning of the tedious *monophysite* controversy.

§ 90.

OF THE THEOLOGICAL AUTHORITY OF THE OECUMENICAL SYNODS.

In this period the utterances of the *oecumenical* councils,[1] as the last and highest ecclesiastical decisions, began to assume an important place among the sources of theological knowledge. As all synods were supposed to be under the peculiar direction of the Holy Spirit prior to the present time, without on that account claiming infallibility,[2] so also the doctrinal decisions of general councils were derived from a peculiar co-operation of the Holy Spirit,[3] but so far were men as yet from attributing to them an exclusive infallibility dependent on their external conditions,

αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐξεπαίδευσε, καὶ τὸ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε σύμβολον. That the true reading must be ἐν δύο φύσεσι (as all the Latins have in duabus naturis) is shown by Mansi vii. 775. Walch. bibl. symb. vetus p. 106, to which we have also to add the testimonies of the Monophysite Severus Patr. Ant. (ap. Mansi vii. 840), Evagrius h. e. ii. c. 4. Leontius Bys. de Sectis. Actio v. c. 7. Agathonis P. ep. ad Constantem ii. (in the Act. Conc. oecum. vi. Act. 4. ap. Mansi xi. 256.). Baur Dreienigkeit i. 820. defends the reading ἐκ δ. φ.

[1] The name σύνοδος οἰκουμενική first in Conc. Constant. ann. 381. can. 6.

[2] According to Act. xv. 28. Conc. Carthag. ann. 252. (in opp. Cypriani): Placuit nobis sancto Spiritu suggerente et Domino per visiones multas et manifestas admonente. To what an extent this form of speech proceeded may be seen in Concil. Ephes. ann. 431, above § 88, not. 27. But in a similar formula spake also a partial council at Constantinople, which condemned Eutyches. See above § 89. not. 6.

[3] Constantini epist. ad Eccl. Alexandr. (Socrates i. 9.): In reference to the Nicene council: ὃ γὰρ τοῖς τριακοσίοις ἤρεσεν Ἐπισκόποις, οὐδέν ἐστιν ἕτερον, ἢ τοῦ Θεοῦ γνώμη, μάλιστά γε ὅπου τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τοιούτων καὶ τηλικούτων ἀνδρῶν ταῖς διανοίαις ἐγκείμενον, τὴν Θείαν βούλησιν ἐξεφώτισεν. Basilii ep. 114. (al. 204.) οἱ τριακόσιοι δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ—οὐκ ἄνευ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐνεργείας ἐφθέγξαντο (τὴν πίστιν). Socrates i. 9. against the Macedonian historian Sabinus, who had pronounced the Nicene fathers ignorant men: οὐκ ἐνθυμεῖται, ὡς, εἰ καὶ ἰδιῶται ἦσαν οἱ τῆς Συνόδου, κατελάμποντο δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, οὐδαμῶς ἀστοχῆσαι τῆς ἀληθείας ἐδύναντο. Thus Isidore Pelus lib. iv. ep. 99. calls the Nicene council Θεόθεν ἐμπνευσθεῖσα.

[4] Epist. Synodi Nicaenae ad Alexandrinos (Theodoret. i. 8) in fine:

that they were put in the same rank with other orthodox synods,[5] and in answering opponents, men did not endeavour to prove that the council was oecumenical, but that its decision was true according to Scripture and tradition.[6]

εὔχεσθε δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁπάντων, ἵνα τὰ καλῶς ἔχειν δόξαντα βέβαια μένοι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κατ' εὐδοκίαν γεγενημένα, ὥς γε πεπιστεύκαμεν, τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. In Socrates i. c. 9 this passage has been altered. Augustinus de baptismo contra donatistas ii. 3: Quis autem nesciat, sanctam scripturam canonicam—omnibus posterioribus Episcoporum literis ita praeponi, ut de illa omnino dubitari et disceptari non possit, utrum verum vel utrum rectum sit, quidquid in ea scriptum esse constiterit: Episcoporum autem literas—per sermonem forte sapientiorem,—et per aliorum Episcoporum graviorem auctoritatem,—et per concilia licere reprehendi, si quid in eis forte a veritate deviatum est: et ipsa concilia, quae per singulas regiones vel provincias fiunt, plenariorum conciliorum auctoritati, quae fiunt ex universo orbe christiano, sine ullis ambagibus cedere: ipsaque plenaria saepe priora posterioribus emendari, quum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clausum erat, et cognoscitur quod latebat, sine ullo typho sacrilegae superbiae, sine ulla inflata cervice arrogantiae, sine ulla contentione lividae invidiae, cum sancta humilitate, cum pace catholica, cum caritate christiana.

[5] Constantinus epist. ad Episcopos, qui Conc. Nicaeno non interfuerunt (Euseb. de vita Const. iii. 20. and Socrates i. 9.) says generally: πᾶν γὰρ, εἴ τι δ' ἂν ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις τῶν ἐπισκόπων συνεδρίοις πράττηται, τοῦτο πρὸς τὴν θείαν βούλησιν ἔχει τὴν ἀναφοράν. Thus Athanasius places the Concil. Antiochen. A.D. 269, to which his opponents appealed in defence of their rejection of the term ὁμοούσιον, on an equality with the Nicene in point of theological authority. De Synodis c. 43: συγχρούειν μὲν γὰρ τούτους πρὸς ἐκείνους ἀπρεπές· πάντες γάρ εἰσι πατέρες· διακρίνειν δὲ πάλιν, ὡς οὗτοι μὲν καλῶς, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ τοὐναντίον εἰρήκασιν, οὐχ ὅσιον· οἱ πάντες γὰρ ἐκυμήθησαν ἐν Χριστῷ. Οὐ χρὴ δὲ φιλονεικεῖν, οὐδὲ τῶν συνελθόντων τὸν ἀριθμὸν συμβάλλειν, ἵνα μὴ δοκῶσιν οἱ τριακόσιοι τοὺς ἐλάττονας ἐπικρύπτειν· οὐδ' ἂν πάλιν τὸν χρόνον ἀναμετρεῖν, ἵνα μὴ δοκῶσιν οἱ προλαβόντες ἀφανίζειν τοὺς μετὰ ταῦτα γενομένους· οἱ πάντες γὰρ καθὰ προείρηται πατέρες εἰσί.

[6] Augustinus contra Maximinum Arian. ii. 14, 3: Sed nunc nec ego Nicaenum, nec tu debes Ariminense tamquam praejudicaturus proferre concilium. Nec ego hujus auctoritate, nec tu illius detineris: Scripturarum auctoritatibus, non quorumque propriis, sed utrisque communibus testibus, res cum re, causa cum causa, ratio cum ratione concertet.

THIRD CHAPTER.

HISTORY OF THE HIERARCHY.

Planck's Geschichte der christl. kirchl. Gesellschaftsverfassung, i. 276. C. Riffel's gesch. Darstellung des Verhältnisses zwischen Kirche u. Staat. Mainz 1836 8. i., 114.

§ 91.

GROWING IMPORTANCE OF THE CLERGY.

The Christian emperors enlarged the privileges already granted by Constantine to the church and the clergy (Div. i. § 56, not. 30. ff.), by new tokens of their favour. They released church lands and the clergy from *certain civil duties*,[1] but by no means from *all* taxes;[2] gave a legal confirmation to the decisions which the bishops pronounced in *ecclesiastical* affairs,[3] and which they also gave as

[1] Besides the municipal offices (see Div. I. § 56. note 30), both the clergy and church property were freed from the muneribus sordidis and extraordinariis (cf. Cod. Theod. lib. xi. tit. 15. de extraordinariis sive sordidis muneribus and Gothofredi paratitlon), from the metatis (Cod. Th. l. vii. t. 8. de metatis), the angariis and parangariis (Cod. Th. l. viii. t. 5. de cursu publico, angariis et parangariis), and finally the immunity of the clerici negotiantes from the lustralis conlatio (Cod. Th. l. xiii. t. 1. de lustrali conlatione comp. Hegewisch hist. Versuch über die röm. Finanzen S. 307 ff.). Comp. besides the works cited Cod. Theod. l. xvi. ii. 8. 19, &c. Comp. Binghami origg. eccl. vol. ii. p. 227. Planck i. 289.

[2] Constantine had indeed at first, in the year 315, also released the church lands from the tributis ordinariis (Cod. Theod. xi. i. 1), but they were soon after again subjected to this tribute, and when the council of Ariminum (A.D. 359) applied to Constantine, ut juga, quae videntur ad Ecclesiam pertinere, a publica functione cessarent, inquietudine desistente, he flatly denied the request, Cod. Theod. xvi. ii. 15. Gratian even subjected the church lands to the extraordinariis collationibus (Cod. Theod. xi. xvi. 15). So also Theodosius l. c. l. 18. Honorius released them from the extraordinaria l. c. l. 21. 22. Theodosius ii. subjected them again to the angariis and parangariis. Cod. Justin. i. ii. 11. Comp. Ambrosii orat. de basilicis non tradendis haereticis: Si tributum petit Imperator, non negamus. Agri ecclesiae solvunt tributum. Si agros desiderat Imperator, potestatem habet vindicandorum, nemo nostrum intervenit, &c. Riffel i. 153.

[3] Euseb. de vita Const. iv. c. 27. See below note 4. Comp. the law

chosen umpires in *civil disputes*,[4] allowed *the clergy* to be bound to this arbitration-sentence,[5] and even put them in cases of dis-

of Honorius A.D. 399. (Cod. Theod. xvi. xi. 1.): Quotiens de religione agitur, Episcopos convenit judicare, caeteras vero causas, quae ad ordinarios cognitores, vel ad usum publici juris pertinent, legibus oportet audiri.

[4] Respecting these episcopal arbitration-decisions comp. Div. i. § 69. note 6. It had been always reckoned unchristian to depart from them, and thus public opinion demanded for them the preference, so that they laid the foundation of an actio rei judicatae. This privilege has been usually ascribed to Constantine with reference to Eusebius de vita Const. iv. 27: *τοὺς τῶν ἐπισκόπων ὅρους τοὺς ἐν συνόδοις ἀποφαινθέντας ἐπεσφραγίζετο· ὡς μὴ ἐξεῖναι τοῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἄρχουσι, τὰ δόξαντα παραλύειν· παντὸς γὰρ εἶναι δικαστοῦ τοὺς ἱερεῖς τοῦ θεοῦ δοκιμωτέρους·* in which *σύνοδος* according to Conc. Carthag. iv. c. 23. (See Div. i. § 69. not. 11) is understood of the presbytery. These arbitrations, however, were not pronounced by the collegia, but by the bishop, and by him sometimes committed to individual presbyters and deacons, by Sylvanus bishop of Troas, even wholly to an honest layman (Socrates vii. 37); see Bingham vol. i. p. 130; and thus that passage appears to refer to the decisions and sentences of the provincial synods. Sozomen i. c. 9 is indeed more distinct: *τῶν δὲ Ἐπισκόπων ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὴν κρίσιν ἐτέτρεψε (Κωνσταντῖνος) τοῖς δικαζομένοις, ἢν βούλωνται τοὺς πολιτικοὺς ἄρχοντας παραιτεῖσθαι· κυρίαν δὲ εἶναι τὴν αὐτῶν ψῆφον, καὶ κρείττω τῆς τῶν ἄλλων δικαστῶν, ὡσανεὶ παρὰ τοῦ Βασιλέως ἐξενεχθεῖσαν· εἰς ἔργον δὲ τὰ κρινόμενα ἄγειν τοὺς ἄρχοντας, καὶ τοὺς διακονουμένους αὐτοῖς στρατιώτας· ἀμεταστρέπτους τε εἶναι τῶν Συνόδων τοὺς ὅρους.* Still this seems to be only an amplified interpretation of that passage in Eusebius. The oldest law extant on the subject is A.D. 408. (Cod. Justin. i. iv. 8.) Honor. et Theod. AA. Theodoro P. P. Episcopale judicium ratum sit omnibus, qui se audiri a Sacerdotibus elegerint: eamque illorum judicationi adhibendam esse reverentiam jubemus, quam vestris deferri necesse est potestatibus, a quibus non licet provocare. Per judicum quoque Officia, ne sit cassa episcopalis cognitio, definitioni executio tribuatur. cf. Augustin. in Psalm. 25. § 13. (about 415): principes saeculi tantum detulerunt Ecclesiae, ut quidquid in ea judicatum fuerit, dissolvi non possit. But as a like privilege was granted to the Jewish patriarchs as early as 398 (Cod. Theod. ii. i. 10), we may fairly assume that the Christian bishops also were earlier possessed of it. H. M. Hebenstreit hist. jurisdictionis ecclesiasticae ex legibus utriusque codicis illustrata, diss. iii. Lips. 1773 ss. 4. B. Schilling de origine jurisdictionis ecclesiasticae in causis civilibus. Lips. 1825. 4. C. F. A. Jungk de originibus et progressu episcopalis judicii in causis civilibus laicorum usque ad Justinianum. Berol. 1832. 8.

[5] Conc. Carthag. iii. ann. 397. c. 9: Item placuit, ut quisquis Episcoporum, Presbyterorum, et Diaconorum, seu Clericorum, cum in Ecclesia ei crimen fuerit intentatum, vel civilis causa fuerit commota, si relicto ecclesiastico judicio, publicis judiciis purgari voluerit, etiamsi pro ipso fuerit prolata sententia, locum suum amittat, et hoc in criminali judicio. In civili vero perdat quod evicit, si locum suum obtinere voluerit. Cui

cipline under spiritual courts,[6] without however conceding to the bishops a civil jurisdiction.[7] But the old ecclesiastical rights of the clergy, particularly *the right of superintending morals,* and *the right of interference on behalf of all the unfortunate,* received quite another importance after they had been

enim ad eligendos judices undique patet auctoritas, ipse se indignum fraterno consortio judicat, qui de universa Ecclesia male sentiendo de judicio seculari poscit auxilium, cum privatorum Christianorum causas Apostolus ad Ecclesiam deferri, atque ibi terminari praecipiat. Conc. Calced. c. 9: Εἴ τις κληρικὸς πρὸς κληρικὸν πρᾶγμα ἔχει, μὴ καταλιμπανέτω τὸν οἰκεῖον Ἐπίσκοπον, καὶ ἐπὶ κοσμικὰ δικαστήρια καταγερχέτω.—εἰ δέ τις παρὰ ταῦτα ποιήσει, κανονικοῖς ὑποκείσθω ἐπιτιμίοις.

[6] Lex Constantii (Cod. Theod. xvi. xi. 12,) A.D. 355: Mansuetudinis nostrae lege prohibemus, in judiciis Episcopos accusari.—Si quid est igitur querelarum, quod quispiam defert, apud alios potissimum Episcopos convenit explorari. Gratiani (ibid. l. 23,) A.D. 376: Qui mos est causarum civilium, idem in negotiis ecclesiasticis obtinendus est: ut si qua sunt ex quibusdam dissensionibus, levibusque delictis, ad religionis observantiam pertinentia, locis suis, et a suae Diœceseos Synodis audiantur: exceptis quae actio criminalis ab ordinariis extraordinariisque judicibus, aut illustribus potestatibus audienda constituit. Honorii (ibid. l. 41,) A.D. 412: Clericos non nisi apud Episcopos accusari convenit, Valentiniani iii. (ibid. l. 47, A.D. 425): Clericos—episcopali audientiae reservamus: fas enim non est, ut divini muneris ministri temporalium potestatum subdantur arbitrio.

[7] The limits of episcopalis audientia are definitely given by Valentiniani iii. novella de episcopali judicio A.D. 442, (ed. Gothofred. nov. Val. tit. xii. ed. Haenell nov. xxxiv.): De episcopali judicio diversorum saepe causatio est. Ne ulterius querela procedat, necesse est praesenti lege sanciri. Itaque cum inter clericos jurgium vertitur, et ipsis litigatoribus convenit, habeat, Episcopus licentiam judicandi, praeeunte tamen vinculo compromissi. Quod et laicis, si consentiant, auctoritas nostra permittit. Aliter eos judices esse non patimur, nisi voluntas jurgantium interposita, sicut dictum est, conditione praecedat: quoniam constat, Episcopos et Presbyteros forum legibus non habere, nec de aliis causis, secundum Arcadii et Honorii divalia constituta, quae Theodosianum corpus ostendit, praeter religionem, posse cognoscere. Sin vero petitor laicus, seu in civili seu criminali causa, cujuslibet loci Clericum adversarium suum, si id magis eligat, per auctoritatem legitimam in publico judicio respondere compellat. Quam formam etiam circa Episcoporum personam observari oportere censemus. Ut si in hujuscemodi ordinis homines actionem pervasionis et atrocium injuriarum dirigi necesse fuerit, per procuratorem solemniter ordinatum apud judicem publicum inter leges et jura confligant, judicati exitu ad mandatores sine dubio reversuro. Quod iis religionis et sacerdotii veneratione permittimus. Nam notum est, procurationem in criminalibus negotiis non posse concedi. Sed ut sit ulla discretio meritorum, Episcopis et Presbyteris tantum id oportet impendi. In reliquis negotiis criminalibus juxta legum ordinem per se judicium subire coguntur.

recognised by the state, from the elevation of Christianity into the state religion. The persons of magistrates also now became subject to the inspection of the public morals; yea, even the emperors themselves, as far as they were Christians;[8] and the duty of interference on behalf of the unfortunate established a right of intercession with the civil power,[9] which often exhibited

[8] Conc. Arelatense ann. 314, c. 7: De praesidibus, qui fideles ad praesidatum prosiliunt, placuit ut, cum promoti fuerint, literas accipiant ecclesiasticas communicatorias (Comp. div. i. § 41, not. 5): ita tamen, ut in quibuscunque locis gesserint, ab Episcopo ejusdem loci cura de illis agatur, et cum coeperint contra disciplinam agere, tum demum a communione excludantur. Similiter et de his qui rempublicam agere volunt. Gregor. Naz. orat. xvii. p. 271, thus addresses the *δυνάσται καὶ ἄρχοντες*: *ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ νόμος ὑποτίθησιν ὑμᾶς τῇ ἐμῇ δυναστείᾳ καὶ τῷ ἐμῷ βήματι ἄρχομεν γὰρ καὶ αὐτοί, προσθήσω δ' ὅτι καὶ τὴν μείζονα καὶ τελεωτέραν ἀρχήν. ἢ δεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑποχωρῆσαι τῇ σαρκί, καὶ τοις γηίνοις τὰ ἐπουράνια;* Thus Athanasius excommunicated a governor of Libya on account of cruelty and excesses; and Basil the Great assures him (ep. 61,) after he had made known this excommunication in his church, *ἀποτρόπαιον αὐτὸν πάντες ἡγήσονται, μὴ πυρὸς, μὴ ὕδατος, μὴ σκέπης αὐτῇ κοινωνοῦντες.* Comp. the excommunication which Synesius, bishop of Ptolemais, uttered against the prefect Andronicus, Synesii epist. 58: *Ἀνδρονίκῳ καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῦ μηδὲν ἀνυιγνύσθω τέμενος τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἅπας αὐτοῖς ἱερὸς ἀποκεκλείσθω καὶ σηκὸς καὶ περίβολος· οὐκ ἔστι τῷ Διαβόλῳ, μέρος ἐν Παραδείσῳ ὃς κἂν λάθῃ διαδὺς, ἐξελαύνεται. Παραινῶ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἰδιώτῃ παντὶ καὶ ἄρχοντι, μήτε ὁμορόφιον αὐτῷ, μήτε ὁμοτράπεζον γίνεσθαι· ἱερεῦσι δὲ διαφερόντως, οἳ μήτε ζῶντας αὐτοὺς προσερροῦσι, μήτε τελευτήσαντας συμπροπέμψουσιν κ. τ. λ.* cf. Clausen de Synesio, Hafn. 1831. 8., p. 152 ss. The bishops of Alexandria, in particular, made themselves objects of fear to the officials of that place. Cyril obtained this see by fighting, although the leader of the army there was against him, Socrates vii. 7: *καὶ γὰρ ἐξ ἐκείνου ἡ Ἐπισκοπὴ Ἀλεξανδρείας παρὰ τῆς ἱερατικῆς τάξεως καταδυναστεύειν τῶν πραγμάτων ἔλαβε τὴν ἀρχήν,* Comp. Socrates vii. c. 13, on the disputes between Cyril and Orestes, prefect of Egypt: *Ὀρέστης δὲ καὶ πρότερον μὲν ἐμίσει τὴν δυναστείαν τῶν ἐπισκόπων, ὅτι παρῃρεῖτο πολὺ τῆς ἐξουσίας τῶν ἐκ βασιλέως ἄρχειν τεταγμένων· μάλιστα δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἐποπτεύειν αὐτοῦ τὰς διατυπώσεις: Κύριλλος ἐβούλετο.*—Theodosius I. was compelled to do penance by Ambrose, (Rufinus xi. 18; Sozom. vii. 25; Theodoret v. 17. Comp. Neander's KG. ii. i. 384). Of Theodosius II. Theodoret v. 36, relates that a monk came to him, *περί τινος δεόμενος, ἐπειδὴ δὲ τοῦτο δράσας πολλάκις οὐκ ἔτυχε, τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς αὐτὸν κοινωνίας ἐκώλυσε, καὶ τὸν δεσμὸν ἐπιδεὶς ὑπεχώρησε.* Nor had the emperor any rest till this fanatic had again freed him from the sentence.

[9] (As the vestals had formerly exercised it, see Cicero pro Fontejo in fine. Sueton. Jul. Caesar c. i. Tiber. c. 2). Conc. Sardic. c. 8, below, § 92, not. 11. Ambrosius de offic. Ministr. ii. c. 21: Adjuvat hoc quoque ad profectum bonae existimationis, si de potentis manibus eripias inopem, de morte damnatum eruas, quantum sine perturbatione fieri potest, ne videamur jactantiae magis causa facere, quam miseri-

itself in a very stormy way in cases where the punishment of death, which the Christians of that time regarded with horror, was decreed.[10] In like manner the acknowledgment of this right of the clergy facilitated the transfer of the *right of asylum* from heathen temples to the Christian churches.[11] All these rights

cordiae, et graviora inferre vulnera, dum levioribus mederi desideramus, cap. 29: Egregie hinc vestrum enitescit ministerium, si suscepta impressio potentis, quam vel vidua vel orphani tolerare non queant, Ecclesiae subsidio cohibeatur, si ostendatis plus apud vos mandatum Domini, quam divitis valere gratiam. Meministis ipsi, quoties adversus regales impetus pro viduarum, immo omnium, depositis certamen subierimus. Commune hoc vobiscum mihi. cf. Thomassini vetus et nova Ecclesiae disciplina de beneficiis p. ii. l. iii. c. 87, and c. 95, 96. Bingham lib. ii. c. 8.

[10] Macedonius, vicar of the diocese of Africa, writes respecting it to Augustine, (August. ep. 152): Officium sacerdotii vestri esse dicitis intervenire pro reis, et nisi obtineatis, offendi, quasi quod erat officii vestri, minime reportetis. Hic ergo vehementer ambigo, utrum istud ex religione descendat. Nam si a Domino peccata adeo prohibentur, ut ne poenitendi quidem copia post primum tribuatur; quemadmodum nos possumus ex religione contendere, ut nobis qualecumque illud crimen fuerit, dimittatur? quod utique, cum impunitum volumus, probamus, &c. To this Augustine replies, ep. 153, ex. gr. § 3: Morum corrigendorum nullus alius quam in hac vita locus est.—Ideo compellimur humani generis caritate intervenire pro reis, ne istam vitam sic finiant per supplicium, ut ea finita non possint finire supplicium. Noli ergo dubitare hoc officium nostrum ex religione descendere, &c. Comp. the intercession for the Circumcelliones who were to have been executed for murders, August. ep. 133, ad Marcellinum Tribunum: Si non audis amicum petentem, audi Episcopum consulentem. Quamvis quoniam Christiano loquar, maxime in tali causa, non arroganter dixerim, audire te Episcopum convenit jubentem. Against violent interferences of the clergy, as they took place for example in Antioch, (Chrysostomi ep. ad Olympiadem and orat. ad popul. Antioch. 17,) Theodosius I. A.D. 392, and Arcadius A.D. 398, enacted laws, (Cod. Theod. ix. xl. 15 and 16). The latter: Addictos supplicio, et pro criminum immanitate damnatos, nulli Clericorum vel Monachorum—per vim atque usurpationem vindicare liceat ac tenere. Quibus in causa criminali humanitatis consideratione, si tempora suffragantur, interponendae provocationis copiam non negamus.—Reos tempore provocationis emenso ad locum poenae sub prosecutione pergentes, nullus aut teneat aut defendat.—Si tanta Clericorum ac Monachorum audacia est, ut bellum potius quam judicium futurum esse existimetur, ad Clementiam Nostram commissa referantur, ut nostro mox severior ultio procedat arbitrio. Ad Episcoporum sane culpam redundabit, si quid forte in ea parte regionis, in qua ipsi populo christianae religionis, doctrinae insinuatione, moderantur, ex his, quae fieri hac lege prohibemus, a Monachis perpetratum esse cognoverint, nec vindicaverint.

[11] At first merely through custom (examples Ammian. Marcell. xxvi.

had long since grown naturally out of the old ecclesiastical notions before the emperors began to confirm them severally by laws.[12]

On the other side, ecclesiastical possessions became very considerable, partly by the liberality of the emperors,[13] partly by the legal permission to accept of inheritances and gifts, which alas, was often abused by the clergy, so as to become legacy-hunting.[14] All these external advantages attracted many to the

3. Zosimus iv. 40; v. 8. Gregor. Naz. orat. xx. in laudem Basilii, opp. i. 353, &c.) which is referred to as already in existence in the restrictive laws of Theodosius I. and Arcadius, (Cod. Theod. ix. 45, 1—3.) and formally confirmed and strictly defined by Theodosius II. in the year 431, (ibid. l. 4). Bingham vol. iii. p. 353 ss. (Abele) Magazin für Kirchenrecht u. Kirkengesch. St. 1. (Leipz. 1778. 8.) S. 189 ss.

[12] So Constantini lex A.D. 329. (Cod. Justin. i. iv. 25): Quae de alea, sive ut vocant cottis, ac de eorum prohibitione a nobis sancita sunt, ea liceat Dei amicissimis Episcopis et perscrutari, et cohibere, si fiant, et flagitiosos per clarissimos Praesides provinciarum, et Patres defensoresque civitatum ad modestiam reducere. Honorii A.D. 408. (Cod. Theod. xvi. x. 19,) in reference to all kinds of idolatry: Episcopis quoque locorum haec ipsa prohibendi ecclesiasticae manus tribuimus facultatem A.D. 409, (Cod. Theod. ix. iii. 7,) after the judges had been admonished to treat the prisoners more humanely: Nec deerit Antistitum christianae religionis cura laudabilis, quae ad observationem constituti judicis hanc ingerat monitionem. cf. Cod. Theod. v. v. 2; v. vii. 2; xv. viii. 2. cf. C. W. de Rhoer dissertt. de effectu religionis christ. in jurisprudentiam. Rom. (Fasc. i. Groningae 1776. 8.) p. 94 ss.

[13] Particularly out of the parochial property of the cities (see § 75. not. 9), the property of the heathen temples (Cod. Theod. xvi. 20) and of heretical churches (Cod. Th. xvi. v. 43. 52. 57. 65. &c.). Hilarius contra Constantium jam vita defunctum c. 10: Auro reipublicae sanctum Dei honoras, et vel detracta templis vel publicata edictis, vel exacta poenis Deo ingeris.

[14] So Gregory Naz. ep. 80 remarks, while admonishing Aërius and Alypius to pay the legacy of their mother into the church, *ὅτι πολλοὶ καὶ ὅλων οἴκων ἐμποιουμένων εἰς Ἐκκλησίας ἠνέσχοντο, οἱ δὲ καὶ παρ' ἑαυτῶν πᾶσαν προσήγοντο τὴν περιουσίαν καὶ τὴν καλλίστην ἐπραγματεύσαντο πραγματείαν, γενέσθαι διὰ τὸν ἐκεῖ πλοῦτον πένητες μὴ τοίνυν σπείρητε φειδομένως, ἵνα πλουσίως θερίσητε,—πάντα μεθ' ἡδονῆς καὶ φαιδρότητος ἐπιδόντες, ἢ ἀποδόντες ὡς οἰκεῖα τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ.* On the other hand, Valentiniani i. lex A.D. 370, ad Damasum Episc. urbis Rom. (Cod. Theod. xvi. ii. 20): Ecclesiastici, aut ex Ecclesiasticis, vel qui continentium se volunt nomine nuncupari, viduarum ac pupillarum domos non adeant: sed publicis exterminentur judiciis, si posthac eos adfines earum vel propinqui putaverint deferendos. Censemus etiam, ut memorati nihil de ejus mulieris, cui se privatim sub praetextu religionis adjunxerint, liberalitate quacunque, vel extremo judicio possint adipisci, et omne in tantum ineffícax sit, quod alicui horum ab his fuerit derelictum, ut nec per subjectam personam valeant aliquid, vel donatione vel testamento, percipere, &c.

spiritual profession,[15] the number of clergy was swelled beyond measure, and to the already existing classes were added parabolani, copiatae.[16] The emperors were obliged to meet this pressure, which became dangerous to the state, with stringent laws.[17]

Under these circumstances the power of the bishops particularly rose. At the head of a numerous clergy completely subject to them, they alone had power to decide on the appropriation of the church estates,[18] and possessed ecclesiastical legislation, by their exclusive privilege of having a voice at synods. Hence they continued to make the country bishops more subservient to them;[19] to the other churches in cities and in the country, (ecclesia ple-

On this subject Jerome epist. 34 (al. 2) ad Nepotianum: Nec de lege conqueror, sed doleo, cur meruerimus hanc legem. Cauterium bonum est, sed quo mihi vulnus, ut indigeam cauterio? Provida severaque legis cautio, et tamen nec sic refraenatur avaritia. Comp. the laws of Theodosius ii. l. c. l. 27 and 28.

[15] In a one-sided way Athanasius hist. Arian. ad Monachos c. 78, designates only the Meletian clergy ἀς *οἱ μὲν ἐξ εἰδώλων ἐλθόντες, οἱ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ βουλευτηρίου, καὶ τῆς πρώτης πολιτείας, διὰ τὴν ταλαίπωρον ἀλειτουργησίαν καὶ προστασίαν.* Basilius ep. 54 blames his country bishops on account of their subservience to men, *τῶν πλείστων φόβῳ τῆς στρατολογίας εἰσποιούντων ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ὑπηρεσίᾳ.*

[16] In the work entitled de septem ordinibus Ecclesiae (opp. ed. Martian. v. 100) ascribed to Jerome, the copiatae appear under the name fossarii as the lowest order of the clergy. According to a law of Theodosius II. A.D. 416 (Cod. Theod. xvi. ii. 42) no more than 500 parabolani were to be in Alexandria. In the year 418 he permitted 600 (ibid. l. 43). The same emperor reduced the number of copiatae in Constantinople from 1100 to 950 (Cod. Just. i. ii. 4.)

[17] Constantine's law to this effect before the year 320 (Cod. Theod. xvi. ii. 3): Nullum deinceps Decurionem, vel ex Decurione progenitum, vel etiam instructum idoneis facultatibus, atque obeundis publicis muneribus opportunum, ad Clericorum nomen obsequiumque confugere: sed eos de cetero in defunctorum duntaxat Clericorum loca subrogari, qui fortuna tenues, neque muneribus civilibus teneantur obstricti. Constantius allowed in 361 (Cod. Th. xii. i. 49) every curialis admission into the clerical office, curia promente consensum, maxime si totius populi vocibus expetatur: otherwise he should give over his property to his children, or relatives, or the senate. This resigning of goods became afterwards a general law (Cod. Th. xii. i. 59. 99. 104. 115. 121. 123. 163. 172, &c.). Riffel i. 164.

[18] Riffel i. 128.

[19] See Div. i. § 68. not. 2. Conc. Antioch. ann. 341. can. 10: *τοὺς χωρεπισκόπους, εἰ καὶ χειροθεσίαν εἶεν ἐπισκόπων εἰληφότες, ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ—καθιστᾷν ἀναγνώστας καὶ ὑποδιακόνους καὶ ἐφορκιστὰς,—μήτε δὲ πρεσβύτερον μήτε διάκονον χειροτονεῖν τολμᾷν δίχα τοῦ ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐπισκόπου, ἢ ὑπόκεινται αὐτός τε καὶ ἡ χώρα,—χωρεπίσκοπον δὲ γίνεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ τῆς*

bana, titulus), except the head church (eccl. cathedralis) they sent according to their own free choice, presbyters (parochus, plebanus),[20] to conduct the worship of God, who were entirely dependent on them even in the matter of maintenance. The first person next to the bishop was *the archdeacon*,[21] who helped him to manage the revenues. *The arch-presbyters*,[22] an order which arose about the same time, were of far inferior rank. All the lower clergy and the presbyters too were now chosen by the bishop alone. The choice of bishops mostly depended on the other bishops of the provinces, except when the emperors interfered. Still, however, the consent of the people was required, and was not without weight, especially in the west.[23]

Under these external advantages, it is not surprising that the prevailing notions of priestly dignity, and especially of the bishops' authority rose higher and higher; and that the bishops externally enjoyed the highest demonstrations of respect, their claims as the vicars of Christ and the successors of the apostles being capable of indefinite development.[24] Yet their overweening pride often gave just cause for complaint.[25]

πόλεως, ἢ ὑπόκειται, ἐπισκόπου. Conc. Laodiceni (between 320 and 372) Can. 57: ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἐν ταῖς κώμαις, καὶ ἐν ταῖς χώραις καθίστασθαι ἐπισκόπους, ἢ ἀλλὰ περιοδευτάς· τοὺς μέντοι ἤδη προκαταστα θέντας μηδὲν πράττειν ἄνευ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τοῦ ἐν τῇ πόλει. ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους μηδὲν πράττειν ἄνευ τῆς γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου. Probably it was not meant by this canon to do away with the existing country bishops, but only to prevent the establishment of new bishoprics. Accordingly, we find frequent mention of country bishops long after. Basil the Great had 50 in his diocese (Gregor. Naz. de vita sua p. 8), Theodoret ep. 113 names two of his suburbans, &c.

[20] Thomassini vetus et nova eccles. disciplin. p. i. lib. 2. c. 21 ss. Bingham lib. ix. c. 8. vol. iii. p. 590.

[21] Thomassini p. i. lib. 2. c. 17. Bingham vol. i. p. 338. J. G. Pertsch Abhandl. v. d. Ursprunge der Archidiaconen 2 c. Hildesheim 1743. 8.

[22] Thomassini p. i. lib. 2. c. 3. Bingham vol. i. p. 301.

[23] The bishop was chosen Ἐπισκόπων συνόδῳ, ψήφῳ Κληρικῶν, αἰτήσει λαῶν (Petri Alex. epist. in Theodoreti h. e. iv. 19). The person elected by the clergy was either accepted by the voice of the people crying out Ἄξιος, bene meritus, bene dignus; or they cried Ἀνάξιος (Augustini epist. 110. Philostorgius ix. 10. Constitut. Apost. viii. 4). Leo epist. 10. c. 3: Qui praefuturus est omnibus, ab omnibus eligatur. Thomassini p. ii. lib. 2. c. 2 and 3. Bingham vol. ii. p. 90 ss. Staudenmaier's Gesch. d. Bischofswahlen S. 24. Riffel i. 574.

[24] The assertion, so pregnant with consequences, that the priesthood stands above royalty, in which during the third century nothing but a

§ 92.

DEPENDENCE OF THE HIERARCHY ON THE STATE.

Notwithstanding these outward honours enjoyed by the hierarchy, they could the less escape from a dependence on the state in many ways,[1] as they presented a vulnerable side to it by their inheriting property;[2] and as the government of the Ro-

secret pride could take delight (Div. i. § 69. not. 1), was not only repeated, (see Chrysostomus homil. 4. de verbis Isaiae, de Sacerdotio iii. c. 1, homil. 15. in epist. ii. ad Corinth. comp. Gregor. Naz. above not. 8,) but was now also outwardly manifested in the conduct. Standing titles of the bishops were Dominus beatissimus (comp. Wigger's Augustinismus ii. 37) or sanctissimus, reverendissimus, *δεσπότης ὁσιώτατος, αἰδεσιμώτατος.* Beatitudo, Sanctitas tua, *ἡ σὴ χρηστότης, μακαριότης* or *ἁγιότης.* Marks of reverence which were paid them even by emperors were the *ὑποκλίνειν κεφαλήν* and *καταφιλεῖν τὰς χεῖρας.* See Bingham vol. i. p. 134. When Eusebia, spouse of the emperor Constantius, did not observe such things in receiving the salutations of the bishops, the Eusebian bishop of Tripolis, Leontius, declared to her (Philostorgius ap Suidam s. v. *Λεόντιος*), that he would appear before her only under the following conditions: *ἵν' εἰσέλθοιμι μὲν ἐγὼ, σὺ δ' αὐτίκα τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ ὑψηλοῦ κατάβασα, μετ' αἰδοῦς ὑπαντήσειας ἐμοί, καὶ πὴν κεφαλὴν ὑπόσχῃς ταῖς ἐμαῖς χερσὶν, εὐλογιῶν ἀξιουμένη· κἄπειτα καθεσθείην μὲν ἂν ἐγὼ, σὺ δ' ἂν ἑστήκοις αἰδουμένη, ὁπόταν δε κελεύσαιμι, καθεδουμένη, ἡνίκα δοίην τὸ σύνθημα. Εἰ οὕτως αἰρήσῃ, ἀφικοίμην παρά σε κ. τ. λ.* Comp. the conduct of bishop Martinus at the court of Maximus. At table the emperor ordered the cup to be first presented to him (Sulp. Severus de vita Mart. c. 20), expectans atque ambiens, ut ab illius dextera poculum sumeret. Sed Martinus ubi ebibit, pateram presbytero suo tradidit, nullum scilicet existimans digniorem, qui post se biberet. At another time the empress waited on him at table (Sulp. Severi dial. ii. 6). Comp. generally: Chrysostomus de sacerdotio. The work de dignitate, found among the writings of Ambrose is not by him, but by Gerbert (Sylvester ii. about 1000). See Mabillon analecta p. 103.

[25] Hieronym. ad Tit. c. 1: De episcopatu intumescunt, et putant se non dispensationem Christi sed imperium consecutos.—Sciat episcopus et presbyter sibi populum conservum esse, non servum.

[1] The two Luciferians Faustinus and Marcellinus in libello precum first complained of this (Bibl. PP. Lugd. v. 656): Imperatoris arbitrio Episcopi nunc ex catholicis fiunt haeretici, et iidem Episcopi ex haereticis ad fidem catholicam revertuntur. Isidorus Pelus. lib. v. ep. 268. ad Cyrill. Episc.: *Πάλαι μὲν ἡ ἱερωσύνη πταίουσαν τὴν βασιλείαν διωρθοῦτο καὶ σωφρόνιζε, νῦν δὲ ὑπ' ἐκείνην γέγονεν κ. τ. λ.* Socrates lib. iv. Prooem. *ἀφ' οὗ χριστιανίζειν ἤρξαντο (οἱ βασιλεῖς), τὰ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας πράγματα ἤρτητο ἐξ αὐτῶν, καὶ αἱ μέγισται Σύνοδοι τῇ αὐτῶν γνώμῃ γεγόνασί τε καὶ γίνονται.*

[2] Faustinus and Marcellinus l. c. p. 654, respecting the bishops who

man emperors, since the removal of their residence to the east, began to assume an oriental, despotic character.[3]

The first occasion of interference in ecclesiastical matters was offered by the hierarchy itself when involved in an uninterrupted series of controversies.[4] The emperors wished, and were also according to the desire of the hierarchy, to tolerate only the catholic church;[5] but as this name was claimed exclusively by so many parties, the emperors were obliged to decide to which it belonged, and what doctrine accordingly should be considered the catholic doctrine.[6] To this end they summoned councils, allowing them to consult under the superintendence of their commissioners;[7] and then gave imperial confirmation to their

had fallen away under Constantius (see § 82. note 14): Non dignantur pro Christo Filio Dei exilium perpeti, cum propriis sedibus et Ecclesiarum perniciossimis possessionibus oblectantur.—Episcopi plus iram regis terreni timuerunt quam Christum.

[3] C. W. de Rhoer dissertt. de effectu relig. christ. in jurisprudentiam Romanam p. 40 ss.

[4] First by the Donatists. See Div. i.

[5] Constantine's law A.D. 326 (Cod. Theod. xvi. v. 1): Privilegia, quae contemplatione religionis indulta sunt, catholicae tantum legis observatoribus prodesse oportet. Haereticos autem, atque schismaticos non tantum ab his privilegiis alienos esse volumus, sed etiam diversis muneribus constringi et subjici.

[6] Comp. the law of Theodosius I. A.D. 380. Cod. Theod. xvi. 1, 2. see above § 83. not. 32.

[7] Eusebius de vita Const. i. 44: ἐξαίρετον τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ νέμων φροντίδα, διαφερομένων τινῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους κατὰ διαφόρους χώρας, οἷά τις κοινὸς ἐπίσκοπος ἐκ θεοῦ καθεσταμένος, συνόδους τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ λειτουργῶν συνεκρότει. Constant. epist. ad Syn. Tyriam (ibid. iv. 42): ἀπέστειλα πρὸς οὓς ἐβουλήθητε τῶν ἐπισκόπων, ἵνα παραγενόμενοι, κοινωνήσωσιν ὑμῖν τῶν φροντισμάτων· ἀπέστειλα Διονύσιον τὸν ἀπὸ ὑπατικῶν, ὃς καὶ τοὺς ὀφείλοντας εἰς τὴν σύνοδον ἀφικέσθαι μεθ' ὑμῶν ὑπομνήσει, καὶ τῶν πραττομένων, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ τῆς εὐταξίας κατάσκοπος παρέσται· ἐὰν γάρ τις, ὡς ἐγὼ οὐκ οἴομαι, τὴν ἡμετέραν κέλευσιν καὶ νῦν διακρούσασθαι πειρώμενος, μὴ βουληθῇ παραγενέσθαι, ἐντεῦθεν παρ' ἡμῶν ἀποσταλήσεται, ὃς ἐκ βασιλικοῦ προστάγματος αὐτὸν ἐκβαλὼν, ὡς οὐ προσῆκεν ὅροις αὐτοκράτορος ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας ἑξενεχθεῖσιν ἀντιτείνειν, διδάξει. The emperor gave full powers to the tribune Marcellinus to decide the controversy between the Catholics and Donatists A.D. 411. See Gesta Collationis Carthaginensis diei i. c. 4. (annexed to Optatus Milev. ed. du Pin p. 247): Cui quidem disputationi principe loco te judicem volumus residere, omnemque vel in congregandis Episcopis, vel evocandis, si adesse contemserint, curam te volumus sustinere, ut et ea, quae ante mandata sunt, et quae nunc statuta cognoscis, probata possis implere solertia: id antè omnia servaturus, ut ea quae circa catholicam legem vel olim ordinavit antiquitas, vel parentum nostrorum auctoritas religiosa constituit, vel nostra serenitas roboravit,

decrees.[8] But when the controversy was not terminated by this means, as usually happened, the emperors were often led by political, often by religious motives, often by court cabals, to step in with new decisions, sometimes taking a middle course, sometimes giving the superiority to the party formerly condemned.[9] The party favoured by the emperor then appeared to look upon the civil power as exercised only for the protection of the church,[10] and none but the defeated maintained that matters of faith should not be submitted to the emperor's decision, but to the bishops.[11]

Besides these great party questions, individuals among the clergy had also many particular cases in which the interference of the emperors was solicited, although councils soon forbade such supplications to the emperor.[12] The clergy indeed endea-

novella subreptione submota, integra et inviolata custodias. Comp. Fuch's Bibl. der Kirchenversammlungen. Th. 3. S. 166.

[8] Epist. Conc. ii. oecumen. (Constantinop. ann. 381) ad Theodosium Imp. (Mansi iii. p. 557): *δεόμεθα τοίνυν τῆς σῆς ἡμερότητος γράμματι τῆς σῆς εὐσεβίας ἐπικυρωθῆναι τῆς συνόδου τὸν ψῆφον· ἵν' ὥσπερ τοῖς τῆς κλήσεως γράμμασι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τετίμηκας, οὕτω καὶ τῶν δοξάντων ἐπισφραγίσῃς τὸ τέλος.* cf. de Marca de concord. Sac. et Imp. lib. ii. c. 10. § 10 ss. lib. vi. c. 22.

[9] Thus Athanasius hist. Arian. ad Mon. c. 33. puts into the mouth of Constantius, in reply to the bishops assembled in Milan (355) these words: *ὅπερ ἐγὼ βούλομαι, τοῦτο κανὼν νομιζέσθω· οὕτω γάρ μου λέγοντος ἀνέχονται οἱ τῆς Συρίας λεγόμενοι ἐπίσκοποι. ἢ τοίνυν πείσθητε, ἢ καὶ ὑμεῖς ὑπερόριοι γενήσεσθε.*

[10] To the Donatists, who reported the imperial decisions with the words (Optatus Milev. i. 22.): quid Christianis cum Regibus? aut quid Episcopis cum palatio? and (ibid. iii. 3.) quid est Imperatori cum Ecclesia? Optatus replies (l. c.): Non Respublica est in Ecclesia, sed Ecclesia in Republica est i.e. in Imperio Romano.—Cum super Imperatorum non sit nisi solus Deus, qui fecit Imperatorem, dum se Donatus super Imperatorem extollit, jam quasi hominum excesserat metas, ut prope se Deum, non hominem aestimaret, non reverendo eum, qui post Deum ab homi nibus timebatur.

[11] Hosii epist. ad Constantium (in Athanasii hist. Arianorum ad Monachos c. 44.): *μὴ τίθει σεαυτὸν εἰς τὰ ἐκκλησιαστικὰ, μηδὲ σὺ περὶ τούτων ἡμῖν παρακελεύου· ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον παρ' ἡμῶν σὺ μάνθανε ταῦτα. σοὶ βασιλείαν ὁ θεὸς ἐνεχείρισεν, ἡμῖν τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐτίστευσε. καὶ ὥσπερ ὁ τὴν σὴν ἀρχὴν ὑποκλέπτων ἀντιλέγει τῷ διαταξαμένῳ θεῷ· οὕτω φοβήθητι, μὴ καὶ σὺ τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἕλκων ὑπεύθυνος ἐγκλήματι μεγάλῳ γένῃ.* So too Athanasius lib. cit. in various passages. Leontius bishop of Tripolis said to Constantius (Suidas s. v. Λεόντιος): *θαυμάζω, ὅπως ἕτερα διέπειν ταχθείς, ἑτέροις ἐπιχειρεῖς, στρατιωτικῶν μὲν καὶ πολιτικῶν πραγμάτων προεστηκώς, Ἐπισκόποις δὲ περὶ τῶν εἰς μόνους Ἐπισκόπους ἡκόντων διαταττόμενος.*

[12] Conc. Antioch. ann. 341. c. 12: *Εἴ τις ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου Ἐπισκόπου κα-*

voured, backed as they were by imperial privileges, to make themselves as independent as possible of the other authorities of the state,[13] but they still acknowledged the emperor to be their highest judge,[14] so much so, that the Roman bishop regarded it a distinction to be judged only by the emperor.[15] None ventured to call in question the supreme authority of the emperor, as far as it did not violate the rights of conscience;[16] and the imperial laws, even when they touched the church, were received

Ἁιρεθεὶς πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, ἢ καὶ Ἐπίσκοπος ὑπὸ συνόδου, ἐνοχλῆσαι τολμήσειε τὰς βασιλέως ἀκοάς, δέον ἐπὶ μείζονα Ἐπισκόπων σύνοδον τρέπεσθαι, καὶ ἃ νομίζει δίκαια ἔχειν προσαναφέρειν πλείοσιν ἐπισκόποις, καὶ τὴν αὐτῶν ἐξέτασίν τε καὶ ἐπίκρισιν ἐκδέχεσθαι· εἰ δὲ τούτων ὀλιγωρήσας ἐνοχλήσειε τῷ βασιλεῖ, καὶ τοῦτον μηδεμιᾶς συγγνώμης ἀξιοῦσθαι, μηδὲ χώραν ἀπολογίας ἔχειν, μηδὲ ἐλπίδα ἀποκαταστάσεως προσδοκᾶν. This is repeated by the Conc. Constantin. ann. 381. c. 6.—Conc. Antioch. c. 11. forbids all the clergy to go to the emperor ἄνευ γνώμης καὶ γραμμάτων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ ἐπισκόπων, καὶ μάλιστα τοῦ κατὰ τὴν μητρόπολιν. Conc. Sardic. can. latinus 8. (graec. 7.): Quidam non cessant comitatum ire Episcopi, et maxime Afri:—ut non solum ad comitatum multas et diversas Ecclesiae non profuturas perferant causas, neque ut fieri solet aut oportet, ut pauperibus, aut viduis, aut pupillis subveniatur; sed et dignitates saeculares et administrationes quibusdam postulent. Haec itaque pravitas olim non solum murmurationes, sed et scandala excitavit. Honestum est autem, ut Episcopi intercessionem his praestent, qui iniqua vi opprimuntur, aut si vidua affligatur, aut pupillus exspolietur: si tamen ista omnia justam habeant causam, aut petitionem. Si ergo vobis, fratres carissimi, placet, decernite, ne Episcopi ad comitatum accedant, nisi forte hi, qui religiosi Imperatoris literis vel invitati, vel evoçati fuerint.—Universi dixerunt: Placet, et constituatur.

[13] See above § 91. not. 5.

[14] Thus Athanasius proffered to Constantine (Athanas. apol. contra Arianos c. 9), νόμιμον ἐπισκόπων σύνοδον συγκροτηθῆναι, ἢ καὶ αὐτὸν (βασιλέα) δέξασθαι τὴν ἀπολογίαν, ὧν ἐπήγαγον αὐτῷ, and for this purpose after the synod of Tyre in person to Constantinople. Socrates i. 33 ss.

[15] Epistola Rom. Concilii ad Gratianum et Valentinianum Impp. A.D. 378. (in J. Sirmondi append. Cod. Theodos. p. 78. and ap. Coustant among Damasi epistt. no. 6.): Accipite aliud quoque, quod vir sanctus (Damasus) vestrae magis conferre pietati, quam sibi praestare desiderat, nec derogare cuiquam, sed principibus adrogare; quoniam non novum aliquid petit, sed sequitur exempla majorum: ut Episcopus Romanus, si concilio ejus causa non creditur, apud concilium se imperiale defendat. Nam et Sylvester Papa a sacrilegis accusatus, apud parentem vestrum Constantinum causam propriam prosecutus est. Et de scripturis similia exempla suppeditant: quod cum a praeside sanctus Apostolus vim pateretur. Caesarem appellavit, et ad Caesarem missus est.

[16] See Optatus, above not. 10. Ambrosius apolog. David. c. 10: nullis David legibus tenebatur, quia liberi sunt Reges a vinculis delictorum, nec enim ullis ad poenam vocantur legibus, tuti Imperii Majestate.

by the bishops with implicit obedience.[17] The great influence exercised by the emperors, partly in filling up the most important episcopal sees, partly in even deposing and appointing bishops without farther ceremony,[18] naturally secured to them the obedience of the clergy, and with it the direction of ecclesiastical affairs. The slavish Greeks now began to attribute to them a priestly character.[19] A strict theory respecting the limits of the ecclesiastical and civil power was not yet laid down.[20]

§ 93.

ORIGIN OF PATRIARCHS, ESPECIALLY IN THE EAST.

Traité historique de la Primauté en l'église par D. Blondel. Genève 1641. fol. —Jo. Morini exercitatt. ecclesiasticae et biblicae. Paris 1669. fol. (diss. i. de Patriarcharum et Primatum origine).—L. E. du Pin de antiqua eccles. disci-

[17] To the law Cod. Theod. xvi. ii. 20. ad Damasum Episc. urbis Rom. (see above § 91. note 14) the remark is annexed: lecta in ecclesiis Rom. (comp. the evasive remarks of Baronius ann. 370. no. 123). Gothofredus ad h. l. gives several examples of the reading of the imperial laws in churches.

[18] Especially in Constantinople. Thomassini vetus et nova Eccl. discipl. p. ii. lib. 2. c. 6. Riffel i. 589.

[19] Assent at the synod of Constantinple in the year 448. (Mansi vi. 733): *πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ βασιλεῖ.* The later emperors seriously laid claim to the priestly dignity by virtue of their being anointed. Thus the abbot Maximus in Constantinople 655 is asked (Mansi xi. 6): Ergo non est omnis christianus Imperator etiam sacerdos? to which indeed he replies Non est. Leo the Isaurian about 730 writes to Pope Gregory II. (Mansi xii. 976): *βασιλεὺς καὶ ἱερεύς εἰμι.* The throne of the emperor in the church was at first beside that of the bishop at the choir, till Ambrose assigned it a place close to the choir. (Sozom. vii. 25). Yet the emperor ventured to lay his oblations on the altar himself. Conc. Quinisext. A.D. 692. can. 69.

[20] Eusebius de vita Const. iv. 24. relates the following, after he had spoken of Constantine's activity against Paganism: *Ἔνθεν εἰκότως αὐτὸς ἐν ἑστιάσει ποτὲ δεξιούμενος ἐπισκόπους, λόγον ἀφῆκεν, ὡς ἄρα εἴη καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπίσκοπος. ὧδέ πη αὐτοῖς εἰπών ἐήμασιν ἐφ' ἡμετέραις ἀκοαῖς· "ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς μὲν τῶν εἴσω τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν ἐκτὸς ὑπὸ θεοῦ καθεσταμένος ἐπίσκοπος ἂν εἴην."* *ἀκόλουθα δ' οὖν τῷ λόγῳ διανοούμενος, τοὺς ἀρχομένους ἅπαντας ἐπεσκόπει, προὔτρεπέ τε ὅση περ ἂν ἡ δύναμις τὸν εὐσεβῆ μεταδιώκειν βίον.* Different explanations of these words of Constantine may be seen in Ch. G. F. Walch de *τοῖς εἴσω τῆς ἐκκλησίας* et *τοῖς ἐκτὸς* Constantini M. in the Commentationes Soc. Gottingensis vol. vi. p. 81 ss. Heinichen excurs. iv. annexed to his edition of Euseb. de vita Const. p. 537. Since an ex-

plina dissertt. Paris. 1686. 4. Diss. i.—L. Thomassini vetus et nova ecclesiae disciplina lib. i. cap. 7–20.—Bingham origg. eccl. lib. ii. cap. 17.—J. W. Janus de origine Patriarcharum christianorum diss. ii. Viteb. 1718. 4.—W. C. L. Ziegler's pragm. Gesch. der kirchl. Verfassungsformen in den ersten sechs Jahrh. Leipzig 1798. 8. S. 164 ff.—Planck's Gesch. d. christl. kirchl. Gesellschaftsverfassung. Bd. 1. S. 598 ff.

In the preceding period it has been already seen, that the three great metropolitans of *Rome*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*, were distinguished from the other metropolitans by having several provinces under their oversight. This institution came up for discussion at *the council of Nice*, probably on occasion of the Meletian schism in Egypt; and was confirmed by the 6th can.[1]

pression like ἐπισκοπος πραγμάτων cannot be pointed out, and there follows immediately after ἐπισκοπεῖν ἀρχομένους, Constantine probably did not mean τὰ ἐκτός, but τοὺς ἐκτός. Οἱ ἐκτός and οἱ ἀρχόμενοι ἅπαντες must be the same, and thus we obtain the following explanation: "be ye the overseers of those who belong to the church, and so far as they belong to it: let me be the overseer of those without the church, and in so far as they are out of it (whether it be wholly as heathen, or partly, i.e. Christians in their civil relations).

[1] Can. Nic. vi.: τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὸν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπισκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν· ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο σύνηθές ἐστιν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. Καθόλου δὲ πρόδηλον ἐκεῖνο, ὅτι εἴ τις χωρὶς γνώμης τοῦ μητροπολίτου γένοιτο ἐπίσκοπος, τὸν τοιοῦτον ἡ μεγάλη σύνοδος ὥρισε μὴ δεῖν εἶναι ἐπίσκοπον. The Romans made what they inferred from this canon in favour of their church the superscription of it in their oldest Cod. canonum (see it ap. Mansi vi. 1186. comp. Labbei observ. ap. Mansi ii. 688), which afterwards was incorporated with the canon. So the Roman legates cited it at the council of Chalcedon (Mansi vii. 444): Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum. Teneat autem et Aegyptus, Libya, et Pentapolis, ita ut Episcopus Alexandriae harum omnium habeat potestatem: quoniam et Romano Episcopo haec est consuetudo &c. But on the other hand, in the Prisca, which dates immediately after the council of Chalcedon (Mansi vi. 1127): Antiqui moris est, ut urbis Romae Episcopus habeat principatum, ut suburbicaria loca et omnem provinciam suam sollicitudine gubernet. Quae vero apud Aegyptum sunt, Alexandriae Episcopus omnium habeat sollicitudinem. Similiter autem et circa Antiochiam, et in caeteris provinciis privilegia propria serventur metropolitanis ecclesiis, &c. Nicolaus I. (A.D. 863) ep. viii. ad Michaelem (ap. Mansi xv. 206) explains the canon thus: Denique si instituta Nicaenae synodi diligenter inspiciantur, invenietur profecto, quia Romanae Ecclesiae nullum eadem Synodus contulit incrementum: sed potius ex ejus forma, quod Alexandriae Ecclesiae tribuerit particulariter, sumpsit exemplum. On the other hand Bellarmine de Romano Pontifice lib. ii. c. 13: Alexandrinum debere gubernare illas provincias, quia Romanus

At the same time provincial synods were still acknowledged at this council as the highest ecclesiastical authority.[2]

But during the subsequent Arian commotions, the provincial synods were too weak to be able to withstand, in the eternal party-strife, powerful opponents who were often supported by state authority. By this means the bishops were induced to form still larger hierarchical associations by which they might individually obtain greater security. In the political, often ecclesiastical separation of the east and west, this new hierarchical development proceeded in a different mode in the two empires.

In *the east*, the political division of the provinces had been followed from the first in the development of the metropolitan institution, and the fundamental principle became more and more established, that the ecclesiastical should constantly follow the political division of provinces.[3] Accordingly, in the formation of larger hierarchical bodies,[4] they adhered to the political distribution of the realm into dioceses, which had been made by

Episcopus ita consuevit, id est, quia Romanus Episcopus ante omnem Conciliorum definitionem consuevit permittere Episcopo Alexandrino regimen Aegypti, Libyae, et Pentapolis, sive consuevit per Alexandrinum Episcopum illas provincias gubernare. In later times, the only point of dispute has been whether in this canon, as the Greek canonists Johannes Scholasticus, Theod. Balsamon, and Zonaras assume, patriarchal rights (so Sirmond, Em. Schelstrate, Natalis Alexander, &c.), or metropolitan rights (so J. Launoy, Sam. Basnage, &c.), are spoken of. The copious literature on the subject may be seen in Sagittarii introduct. in hist. eccl. ii. 1224 ss.

[2] Can. Nic. 4 confirms to the provincial synod its influence in the election of bishops. Canon 5 recognises it as the highest court of appeal in cases of excommunication. Conc. Antioch. ann. 341, c. 15: Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἐπί τισιν ἐγκλήμασιν κατηγορηθείς, κριθείη ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ ἐπισκόπων, πάντες τε σύμφωνοι μίαν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἐξενέγκοιεν ψῆφον· τοῦτον μηκέτι παρ' ἑτέροις δικάζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ μένειν βεβαίαν τὴν σύμφωνον τῶν ἐπὶ ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκόπων ἀπόφασιν. In case of division among the provincial bishops, the metropolitan, according to canon 14, is empowered to summon bishops from the neighbouring province.

[3] Conf. Conc. Antiochen. can. 9, see Div. i. § 68, note 4. When Cappadocia was divided into two provinces A.D. 371, Basil was disposed to resist the application of this principle against the bishop of Tyana, Gregor. Naz. orat. xliii. c. 58 (ed. Coloni orat. xx. p. 355). Ullmann's Gregorius v. Naz. S. 118 ff. On the other hand, Conc. Chalcedon. can. 17: εἰ δέ τις ἐκ βασιλικῆς ἐξουσίας ἐκαινίσθη πόλις, ἢ αὖθις καινισθείη, τοῖς πολιτικοῖς καὶ δημοσίοις τύποις καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν παροικιῶν ἡ τάξις ἀκολουθείτω. Comp. below not. 14.

[4] The first appearance of such larger synods, Conc. Antioch. ann. 341, can. 12, see above § 92, not. 12.

Constantine.[5] The bishops of every diocese became more closely connected with each other; the bishop of the chief city in the diocese was their common president, and was elevated by this means above the other metropolitans. Yet his rights were defined according to earlier ecclesiastical relations, and for this reason were not alike in all dioceses. In Egypt, *the bishop of Alexandria* had almost monarchical power;[6] the power of *the bishop of Antioch* in the east was less;[7] less still was that of *the bishop of Ephesus* in the Asiatic, and that of *the bishop of Caesarea Cappadociae*, in the Pontian diocese. In the Thracian diocese, *Constantinople* had become the political capital instead of Heraclea, and as it was also the chief city of the empire, the power of the bishop of Constantinople, supported by his influence with the emperor, and the consent of the numerous bishops who were always assembled at court (*σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα*),[8] soon extended far beyond the Thracian diocese; but the degree of power

[5] Zosimus ii. 33. Notitia dignitatum utriusque imperii, probably written in the reign of Theodosius II. (cum G. Panzirolli comm. in Graevii thes. antiquitt. Coman. vol. vii. p. 1309 ss.) I. PRAEFECTURA ORIENTIS, 1. Dioecesis Orientis (chief city Antioch); 2. Aegypti (Alexandria); 3. Asiae (Ephesus); 4. Ponti (Caesarea Cappadociae); 5. Thraciae (Heraclea, then Constantinople). II. PRAEF. ILLYRICI ORIENTALIS, after 379 separated from the west, with the chief city Thessalonica. 1. Dioec. Macedoniae; 2. Daciae. III. PRAEF. ITALIAE, 1. Dioec. Romae (Rome); 2. Italiae (Mediolanum); 3. Illyrici occidentalis (Sirmium); 4. Africae (Carthage). IV. PRAEF. GALLIARUM, 1. Dioec. Galliae (Augusta Trevirorum); 2. Hispaniae; 3. Britanniae. Over the prefectures were placed Praefecti Praetorio; over the dioceses or vicariates Vicarii; over the provinces Rectores, with different titles, as consulares, correctores, usually praesides.

[6] Epiphanius haer. 68, § 1: *Τοῦτο γὰρ ἔθος ἐστί, τὸν ἐν τῇ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ Ἀρχιεπίσκοπον πάσης τε Αἰγύπτου καὶ Θηβαΐδος, Μαραιώτου τε καὶ Λιβύης, Ἀμμωνιακῆς Μαραιώτιδός τε καὶ Πενταπόλεως ἔχειν τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν διοίκησιν.* Cf. Clausen de Synesio Hafn. 1831. p. 173.

[7] Hieronymi ad Pammachium contra errores Joann. Hierosol. (A.D. 397) c. 15: Tu qui regulas quaeris ecclesiasticas, et Nicaeni concilii canonibus uteris:—responde mihi: ad Alexandrinum episcopum Palaestina quid pertinet? Ni fallor, hoc ibi decernitur, ut Palaestinae Metropolis Caesarea sit, et totius Orientis Antiochia. Aut igitur ad Caesariensem Episcopum referre debueras—aut si procul expetendum judicium erat, Antiochiam potius literae dirigendae.

[8] Anatolius, bishop of Constantinople, says at the council of Chalcedon, actio iv. (ap. Mansi vii. 92): *συνήθεια ἄνωθεν κεκράτηκε, τοὺς ἐνδημοῦντας τῇ μεγαλωνύμῳ πόλει ἁγιωτάτους ἐπισκόπους, ἡνίκα καιρὸς καλέσῃ, περὶ ἀνακυπτόντων τινῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πραγμάτων συνεῖναι, καὶ διατυποῦν ἕκαστα, καὶ ἀποκρίσεως ἀξιοῦν τοὺς δεομένους.*

depended very much on the personal relations of the reigning patriarch. Such was the state of things when *the second general council* (381), approved of those relations between the bishops of one diocese (can. 2), elevated the diocesan synods above the provincial synods so as to be the highest ecclesiastical court (can. 6), and gave the bishop of *Constantinople* the first rank after the bishop of Rome (can. 3).[9]

Thus in the east the bishops of *Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus,* and *Caesarea,* had obtained an important elevation above the other metropolitans, for they had subjected to themselves the other metropolitans of their dioceses. They received the distinctive names: Ἔξαρχος, Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος,[10] and shortly before the council of Chalcedon, the appellation Πατριάρχης[11] was appropriated to them exclusively. But political relations and hierarchical ambition soon altered this arrangement. The bishops of *Constantinople,* favoured by their position, soon gained an influence over the affairs of other dioceses also,[12] which manifested itself decidedly in the neighbouring dioceses of Asia and

[9] Canon. II.: Τοὺς ὑπὲρ διοίκησιν ἐπισκόπους ταῖς ὑπερορίοις ἐκκλησίαις μὴ ἐπιέναι, μηδὲ συγχέειν τὰς ἐκκλησίας· ἀλλὰ κατὰ τοὺς κανόνας τὸν μὲν Ἀλεξάνδρείας ἐπίσκοπον τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ μόνον οἰκονομεῖν· τοὺς δὲ τῆς Ἀνατολῆς ἐπισκόπους τὴν Ἀνατολὴν μόνην διοικεῖν, φυλαττομένων τῶν ἐν τοῖς κανόσι τοῖς κατὰ Νικαίαν πρεσβείων τῇ Ἀντιοχέων ἐκκλησίᾳ· καὶ τοὺς τῆς Ἀσιανῆς διοικήσεως ἐπισκόπους τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν μόνην οἰκονομεῖν· καὶ τοὺς τῆς Ποντικῆς τὰ τῆς Ποντικῆς μόνον· καὶ τοὺς τῆς Θρᾴκης τὰ τῆς Θρᾳκικῆς μόνον οἰκονομεῖν. Φυλαττομένου δὲ τοῦ προγεγραμμένου περὶ τῶν διοικήσεων κανόνος, εὔδηλον ὡς τὰ καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἡ τῆς ἐπαρχίας σύνοδος διοικήσει κατὰ τὰ ἐν Νικαίᾳ ὡρισμένα. Can. III.: Τὸν μέντοι Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον ἔχειν τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς μετὰ τὸν τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπον, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νέαν Ῥώμην. (Cf. P. de Marca de Constantinopolitani Patriarchatus institutione (in Boehmer's edition, p. 155 ss.) Can. VI.: εἰ δέ συμβαίη ἀδυνατῆσαι τοὺς ἐπαρχιώτας πρὸς διόρθωσιν τῶν ἐπιφερομένων ἐγκλημάτων τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, τότε αὐτοὺς προσιέναι μείζονι συνόδῳ τῶν τῆς διοικήσεως ἐπισκόπων ἐκείνης, ὑπὲρ τῆς αἰτίας ταύτης συγκαλουμένων.

[10] According to the Canon Sardic. vi., every metropolitan is ὁ ἔξαρχος τῆς ἐπαρχίας. On the other hand, shortly before the council of Chalcedon, the bishop of Antioch is called ὁ ἔξαρχος τῆς ἀνατολικῆς διοικήσεως (Conc. Chalcedon. actio xiv.) Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος first applied to the bishop of Alexandria, ap. Athanas. apol. ii. Epiphan. haer. 68. In the acts of the first council of Ephesus it is very frequently given to the bishops of Rome and Alexandria.

[11] In the fourth century a name of respect given to every bishop. Gregor. Nazianz. orat. 20, 32, 41. Gregor. Nyss. orat. funebr. in Meletium. See Suiceri thes. eccl. ii. 640. First confined to the higher bishops by Socrates v. 8, then by Conc. Chalced.

[12] Theodoret. haer. fab. comp. iv. 12. Νεστόριος—τῆς κατὰ Κωνσταν-

Pontus in particular.[13] At first, indeed, they met with resistance; but since it was of moment to the emperors of the eastern Roman empire to make the bishop of their chief city powerful, as being their principal instrument in ruling the church, and to make him equal in rank to the bishop of the capital of the western Roman empire, the council of Chalcedon formally invested the patriarch of Constantinople with the same rank as the bishop of Rome, the superintendence over those three dioceses,[14] and the right of receiving complaints from all the dioceses against metropolitans.[15] Thus the exarchs of Ephesus and Caesarea were

τινούπολιν τῶν ὀρθοδόξων καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας τὴν προεδρίαν πιστεύεται, οὐδὲν δὲ ἧττον καὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἁπάσης.

[13] Comp. Ziegler l. c. S. 184 ff.

[14] Can. Chalced. 28 (Actio xv. ap. Mansi T. vii. 369): Παντα χοῦ τοῖς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ὅροις ἑπόμενοι, καὶ τὸν ἀρτίως ἀναγνωσθέντα κανόνα τῶν ἐν θεοφιλεστάτων ἐπισκόπων γνωρίζοντες, τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς ὁρίζομεν, καὶ ψηφιζόμεθα περὶ τῶν πρεσβείων τῆς ἁγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, νέας Ῥώμης. Καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην, οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀποδεδώκασι τὰ πρεσβεῖα, καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ σκοπῷ κινούμενοι οἱ ἐν θεοφιλέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἀπένειμαν τῷ τῆς νέας Ῥώμης ἁγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ, εὐλόγως κρίναντες, τὴν βασιλείᾳ καὶ συγκλήτῳ τιμηθεῖσαν πόλιν καὶ τῶν ἴσων ἀπολαύουσαν πρεσβείων τῇ πρεσβυτέρᾳ βασιλίδι Ῥώμῃ (cf. lex Theodos. II. ann. 421 below § 94 not. 47), καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς, ὡς ἐκείνην, μεγαλύνεσθαι πράγμασι, δευτέραν μετ' ἐκείνην ὑπάρχουσαν· καὶ ὥστε τοὺς τῆς Ποντικῆς, καὶ τῆς Ἀσιανῆς, καὶ τῆς Θρᾳκικῆς διοικήσεως μητροπολίτας μόνους, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐν τοῖς βαρβαρικοῖς ἐπισκόπους τῶν προειρημένων διοικήσεων χειροτονεῖσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ προειρημένου ἁγιωτάτου θρόνου τῆς κατὰ Κωνσταντινούπολιν ἁγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας· δηλαδὴ ἑκάστου μητροπολίτου τῶν προειρημένων διοικήσεων, μετὰ τῶν τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκόπων, χειροτονοῦντος τοὺς τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκόπους, καθὼς τοῖς θείοις κανόσι διηγόρευται· χειροτονεῖσθαι δέ, καθὼς εἴρηται, τοὺς μητροπολίτας τῶν προειρημένων διοικήσεων παρὰ τοῦ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἀρχιεπισκόπου, ψηφισμάτων συμφώνων, κατὰ τὸ ἔθος, γενομένων, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀναφερομένων. Cf. Edm. Richerii hist. concill. generall. lib. i. c. 8 § 37 ss. Even here the Grecian principle ruled that the rank of their bishops should be determined by the political rank of the cities (see above note 3). Rome was always βασιλίς or βασιλεύουσα; Constantinople, as being Roma Nova, received forthwith the same privileges, but was yet second in rank, ἡ δευτέρα βασιλεύουσα (Themistii orat. iii. p. 41). In accordance with this, the council of Constantinople, 381, determined the rank of the two bishops (see note 9). But after the division of the empire, the east Roman emperors allowed their chief city to sink down into a city of no repute (Cod. Theod. xvi. ii. 45 A.D. 421: urbs Constantinopolitana, quae Romae veteris praerogativa laetatur). Agreeably to that opinion the position of its bishop was determined at Chalcedon. Cf. Spanheimius de usu et praestantia numismatum p. 687. Id. in Juliani orat. i. p. 30, 75. Jo. Massonius ad Gruteri inscriptiones p. 1080.

[15] Can. Chalced. 9: εἰ δὲ καὶ κληρικὸς ἔχοι πρᾶγμα πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον ἐπίσκο-

put back into a middle rank between patriarchs and metropolitans. The *bishops of Antioch* endeavoured likewise to draw over Cyprus into their ecclesiastical diocese, as it belonged to the political diocese of Asia; but the Cyprian bishops received from the Alexandrian party at the council of Ephesus the assurance of their independence. *The bishops of Jerusalem*, supported by the precedence which had been conceded to them at the council of Nice,[16] after having long endeavoured in vain to shake themselves free of their metropolitan in Caesarea, succeeded at last in rising to the rank of patriarchs, by an edict of Theodosius II., and by the synod of Chalcedon, the three Palestines were assigned them as their ecclesiastical domain.[17] At the close of this period, therefore, we have four patriarchs in the east, viz. of *Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, *Jerusalem*.[18] In their dioceses they were looked upon as ecclesiastical centres, to which the other bishops had to attach themselves for the preservation of unity;[19] and constituted, along with their diocesan synod, the highest court of appeal in all ecclesiastical matters of

που, ἢ πρὸς ἕτερον, παρὰ τῇ συνόδῳ τῆς ἐπαρχίας δικαζέσθω. εἰ δὲ πρὸς τὸν τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπαρχίας μητροπολίτην ἐπίσκοπος ἢ κληρικὸς ἀμφισβητοίη, καταλαμβανέτω ἢ τὸν ἔξαρχον τῆς διοικήσεως, ἢ τὸν τῆς βασιλευούσης Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνον, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ δικαζέσθω. Repeated for a particular case can. 17. An ecclesiastical oversight of the west was bestowed on the Roman bishop by Valentinian iii. 445. See below § 94 note 65.

[16] Can. Nicaen. vii.: *Ἐπειδὴ συνήθεια κεκράτηκε καὶ παράδοσις ἀρχαία, ὥστε τὸν ἐν Αἰλίᾳ ἐπίσκοπον τιμᾶσθαι, ἐχέτω τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῆς τιμῆς, τῇ μητροπόλει σωζομένου τοῦ οἰκείου ἀξιώματος.* Comp. Div. i. § 68, not. 12. Thus the Concil. Constant., A.D. 382, in its synodical letters (in Theodoreti hist. eccl. v. 9), calls this church *τὴν μητέρα ἁπασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τὴν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις.*

[17] Ziegler l. c. S. 240 ff.

[18] Concerning their rights see Ziegler S. 272 ff. Planck. i. 610 ff.

[19] Thus Gregorius Naz. epist. 22 ad Caesarienses says of the church of Caesarea in Cappadocia (at the time in the highest rank of hierarchical dignity), *ἡ μήτηρ σχεδὸν ἁπασῶν τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν ἦν τε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, καὶ νῦν ἐστι καὶ νομίζεται, καὶ πρὸς ἣν τὸ κοινὸν βλέπει, ὡς κέντρῳ κύκλος περιγραφόμενος.* When the Egyptian bishops at the council of Chalcedon, after the deposition of Dioscurus, were without a head, and yet required to subscribe Leo's epist. ad Flavianum (Conc. Chalced. act. iv. ap. Mansi vii. p. 53, 55) they declared: *Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου—Λέοντος, ἴσασι πάντες οἱ ἁγιώτατοι ἡμῶν πατέρες, ὅτι ἐν ἅπασιν ἀναμένομεν τὴν γνώμην τοῦ παρ' ἡμῖν ἐσιωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου.—τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς Νικαέων ἅγιοι πατέρες συναγηγερμένοι ἐκανόνισαν τή, ὥστε ἀκολουθεῖν πᾶσαν τὴν Αἰγυπτιακὴν διοίκησιν τῷ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ τῆς μεγαλοπόλεως Ἀλεξανδρείας, καὶ μηδὲν δίχα αὐτοῦ πράττεσθαι παρά τινος τῶν ὑπ' αὐτῷ ἐπισκόπων.—περὶ πίστεώς ἐστιν ὁ ἀγών.—παρὰ γνώμην ἀρχιεπισκόπου οὐ δυνάμεθα*

the diocese; while on the other hand they were considered as the highest representatives of the church, who had to maintain the unity of the church-universal by mutual communication, and without whose assent no measures affecting the interests of the whole church could be taken.[20]

§ 94.

HISTORY OF THE ROMAN PATRIARCHS,[1] AND OF THE HIERARCHY IN THE WEST.

Blondel's Work, cited § 93. Cl. Salmasii librorum de Primatu Papae pars prima, cum apparatu. Lugd. Batav. 1645. 4. Archibald Bower's history of the popes, 5 vols. 4to. London. J. G. Rehr's Gesch. des Papstthums. Leipz. 1801. 1802. 2 Th. 8. Planck. i. 624 ff.

The bishop of Rome stood preeminent above all his brethren at the very commencement of this period, inasmuch as he was bishop of the only apostolic congregation of the west and of the richest church,[2] metropolitan of several provinces, viz. the ten

ὑπογράψαι. And the council allowed them a respite, Can. 30 (Mansi vii. 372), ἄχρις ἂν χειροτονηθῇ ὁ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἀρχιεπίσκοπος.

[20] Liberati breviar. c. 4. Quod audiens (namely, the heresy of Nestor) Cyrillus Alexandrinus Episcopus, cui tunc dabatur primatus de talibus agendi, venerunt ad eum aliqui de populo Constantinopolitano, &c. So Eutyches at the Concil. Constantinop. (Mansi vi. 817) ἀναγινωσκομένης τῆς καθαιρέσεως, ἐπεκαλέσατο τὴν ἁγίαν σύνοδον τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης, καὶ Ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ Ἱεροσολύμων, καὶ Θεσσαλονίκης. Hence he complained at the second synod of Ephesus that Flavianus had excommunicated him on his sole authority, καίτοι μᾶλλον ὀφείλων πρὸ πάντων τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν ἐπιστεῖλαι, οὓς καὶ ἐπεκαλεσάμην, namely, the bishops of Rome and Alexandria (Mansi vi. 641). Hence flattery invented for them in the fifth century the title universalis Episcopus (the bishop who has oversight of the entire church), which Olympius Episc. Evazensis first gives Dioscurus at the Concil. Ephes. ii. (Mansi vi. 855).

[1] Order of succession: Sylvester I. from 314 † 335, Marcus † 336, Julius I. † 352, Liberius banished 355, the Arian Felix till 358, Liberius returns 358 † 366, Damasus † 384, Siricius † 398, Anastasius I. † 402, Innocentius I. † 417, Zosimus † 418, Bonifacius I. † 422. Cälestinus I. † 432, Sixtus III. † 440, Leo I. the Great † 461.

[2] Ammianus Marcellinus xxvii. c. 3: Damasus et Ursinus supra humanum modum ad rapiendam Episcopatus sedem ardentes, scissis studiis asperrime conflictabantur, adusque mortis vulnerumque discrimina adjumentis utriusque progressis: quae nec corrigere sufficiens Juventius (Praef. urbi) nec mollire, coactus vi magna secessit in suburbanum. Et in concertatione superaverat Damasus, parte quae ei favebat instante.

suburbicarian ones,[3] and at the same time, on account of his residence in the principal city of the world. The easterns, ac-

Constatque in basilica Sicinini, ubi ritus Christiani est conventiculum, uno die cxxxvii. reperta cadavera peremtorum: efferatamque diu plebem aegre postea delinitam. Neque ego abnuo, ostentationem rerum considerans urbanarum, hujus rei cupidos ob impetrandum, quod appetunt, omni contentione laterum jurgari debere: cum id adepti, futuri sint ita securi, ut ditentur oblationibus matronarum, procedantque vehiculis insidentes, circumspecte vestiti, epulas curantes profusas, adeo ut eorum convivia regales superent mensas. Qui esse poterant beati revera, si magnitudine urbis despecta quam viciis (conviciis?) opponunt, ad imitationem Antistitum quorundam provincialium viverent: quos tenuitas edendi potandique parcissime, vilitas etiam indumentorum, et supercilia humum spectantia, perpetuo numini verisque ejus cultoribus ut puros commendant et verecundos. Hieronymi ep. 38. (al. 61.) ad Pammachium: Miserabilis Praetextatus, qui designatus consul est mortuus, homo sacrilegus, et idolorum cultor (respecting him see § 78. not. 6. § 79. not. 1.) solebat ludens beato papae Damaso dicere: "Facite me Romanae urbis episcopum, et ero protinus Christianus." Hence the arrogance of the Roman bishops as the stewards of such rich possessions, complained of even by Jerome epist. 101. ad Evangelum, see Pseudo-Augustini perhaps Hilarii Diaconi about 380) quaestt. Vet. et Nov. Test. (in August. opp. T. iii. P. ii. Append.) Quaest. 101: Quia Romanae Ecclesiae ministri sunt, idcirco honorabiliores putantur, quam apud ceteras Ecclesias, propter magnificentiam urbis Romae, quae caput esse videtur omnium civitatum. Si itaque sic est, hoc debent et sacerdotibus suis vindicare: quia, si ii, qui inferiores sunt, crescunt propter magnificentiam civitatis, quanto magis, qui potiores, sublimandi sunt?

[3] Suburbicaria loca in the versio Prisca of the 6th Nicene canon, see above § 93. not. 1. Rufinus hist. eccl. x. 6. gives this canon as follows: Et ut apud Alexandriam et in urbe Roma vetusta consuetudo servetur, ut vel ille Aegypti, vel hic suburbicariarum ecclesiarum sollicitudinem gerat.—Eccles. suburbic. mean, according to Baronius and Bellarmine, Eccl. totius orbis; according to Perronius, Valesius, J. Morinus, Natalis Alexander, Eccl. occidentis; according to J. Gothofredus (Conjectura de suburbicariis regionibus et ecclesiis. Francof. 1617), Claud. Salmasius, J. Launojus, the two Basnages, &c. only the four provinces which were under Praef. urbi (intra centesimum ab urbe lapidem). On the other hand Jac. Sirmond (Censura conjecturae anonymi script. de suburb. regg. et eccll. 1618) has justly asserted that the provinces subject to the Vicarius urbis, or the Dioecesis Romae, were, 1. Campania. 2. Tuscia et Umbria. 3. Picenum suburbicarium. 4. Sicilia. 5. Apulia et Calabria. 6. Bruttii et Lucania. 7. Samnium. 8. Sardinia. 9. Corsica. 10. Valeria. That these constituted the Roman diocese is also evident from Conc. Sardic. synodica ad Julium P. (Mansi iii. p. 41): Tua autem excellens prudentia disponere debet, ut per tua scripta, qui in Sicilia, qui in Sardinia, et in Italia sunt fratres nostri, quae acta sunt et quae definita, cognoscant (cf. Syn. Arelat. epist. Div. i. § 68. not. ii). Comp. du Pin de ant. eccl. discipl. p. 87 ss. Ziegler's Gesch. d. kirchl. Verfassungs-

cording to their political principle, could not but concede the first place among the bishops, and afterwards among the patriarchs, to the bishop of the chief city; while the westerns estimated the dignity of the episcopal seat by another principle,[4] viz. the grade of its apostolic descent; and considered the *apostolic* seats as the heads and centres of the whole church.[5] Hence, even according to this principle, Rome stood preeminent, being a church fonnded by the two chief apostles, and the only apostolic community of the west.[6]

The same feeling of insecurity which led the bishops of the dioceses to unite with one another during the Arian controversy in the east, procured to bishop *Julius* of Rome decisions in the

formen S. 113 Anm. The numerous ancient works on this subject are enumerated in Sagittarianae introd. in hist. eccl. ii. 1223 ss. Fabricii salut. lux Evangelii p. 358 ss.

[4] See Canon Constantinop. iii. and Chalced. xxviii. above § 93. not. 9 and 13.

[5] The fundamental principle of Augustine is given by Pelagius i. ad Episcopos Tusciae A.D. 556 (ap. Mansi ix. 716. also in Agobardus de comparatione utriusque regiminis c. 2.): Beatissimus Augustinus dominicae sententiae memor, qua fundamentum Ecclesiae in apostolicis sedibus collocavit, in schismate esse dicit, quicumque se a praesulis [Agob. praesulum] earumdem sedium auctoritate vel communione suspenderit; nec aliam manifestat esse ecclesiam, nisi quae in pontificibus [Agob. pontificalibus] apostolicarum sedium est solidata radicibus. Hence against the Donatists Augustinus epist. 43. (al. 162.) § 7: Non de presbyteris aut diaconibus aut inferioris ordinis clericis, sed de collegis agebatur, qui possent aliorum collegarum judicio, praesertim apostolicarum ecclesiarum, causam suam integram reservare. Idem contra litteras Petiliani ii. 51: Verumtamen si omnes per totum orbem tales essent, quales vanissime criminaris, cathedra tibi quid fecit Ecclesiae Romanae, in qua Petrus sedit, et in qua hodie Anastasius sedet: vel Ecclesiae Hierosolymitanae, in qua Jacobus sedit, et in qua hodie Joannes sedet, quibus nos in catholica unitate connectimur, et a quibus vos nefario furore separastis? In connection with these passages the following can only be rightly explained: Contra duas epp. Pelag. ad Bonifac. Rom. Eccl. Episcopum i. 2: communis omnibus nobis, qui fungimur Episcopatus officio (quamvis ipse in ea praeemineas celsiore fastigio) specula pastoralis. Epist. 43, § 7: Romana Ecclesia, in qua semper apostolicae cathedrae viguit principatus.

[6] Synodi Sardicensis epist. ad Julium Ep. Rom. (Mansi iii. 40): Hoc enim optimum et valde congruentissimum esse videbitur, si ad caput i. e. ad Petri Apostoli sedem de singulis quibusque provinciis Domini referant sacerdotes. Blondel de la primauté en l'église p. 106, and after him Bower history of the Popes i. 192. and Fuch's Biblioth. d. Kirchenversamml. ii. 128, look upon these words as interpolated.

synod of Sardica (347),[7] giving him the privilege of appointing judges to hear the appeals of condemned bishops, should he look upon them as well founded. But when the dubious choice between *Damasus* and *Ursicinus* (366),[8] although Valentinian I. decided in favour of the former,[9] gave rise to a tedious schism which spread into other provinces also, and to the greatest bit-

[7] On the double originals of the canons of this council, a Greek and a Latin one, see Ballerini, de ant. collect. cann. P. i. cap. 5. Spittler in Meusel's Geschichtsforscher iv. 33.—Can. iii. (from the Dionysius Exig. cod. can. ap. Mansi iii. 23): Osius Episcopus dixit:—Quod si aliquis Episcoporum judicatus fuerit in aliqua causa, et putat se bonam causam habere, ut iterum concilium renovetur; si vobis placet, sancti Petri Apostoli memoriam honoremus, ut scribatur ab his, qui causam examinarunt, Julio Romano Episcopo: et si judicaverit renovandum esse judicium, renovetur, et det judices. Si autem probaverit, talem causam esse, ut non refricentur ea quae acta sunt; quae decreverit confirmata erunt. Si hoc omnibus placet? Synodus respondit: Placet. Can. iv.: Gaudentius Episcopus dixit: Addendum, si placet, huic sententiae, quam plenam sanctitate protulistis; ut, cum aliquis Episcopus depositus fuerit eorum Episcoporum judicio, qui in vicinis locis commorantur, et proclamaverit, agendum sibi negotium in urbe Roma: alter Episcopus in ejus cathedra, post appellationem ejus qui videtur esse depositus, omnino non ordinetur, nisi causa fuerit in judicio Episcopi Romani determinata. Can. vii. (in Graeco v.): Osius Episcopus dixit: Placuit autem, ut, si Episcopus accusatus fuerit, et judicaverint congregati Episcopi regionis ipsius, et de gradu suo eum dejecerint; si appellaverit qui dejectus est, et confugerit ad Episcopum Romanae ecclesiae, et voluerit se audiri : si justum putaverit, ut renovetur examen, scribere his Episcopis dignetur, qui in finitima et propinqua provincia sunt, ut ipsi diligenter omnia requirant, et juxta fidem veritatis definiant. Quod si is qui rogat causam suam iterum audiri, deprecatione sua moverit Episcopum Romanum, ut de latere suo Presbyterum mittat, erit in potestate Episcopi, quid velit, et quid aestimet. Et si decreverit, mittendos esse, qui praesentes cum Episcopis judicent, habentes ejus auctoritatem, a quo destinati sunt, erit in suo arbitrio. Si vero crediderit Episcopos sufficere, ut negotio terminum imponant, faciet, quod sapientissimo consilio suo judicaverit. Comp. de Marca de concord. Sac. et Imp. lib. vii. c. 3, du Pin de ant. eccl. disc. p. 103 ss. That this privilege was only granted to Julius personally, is shown by Richerii hist. concill. generall. T. i. c. 3, § 4. Doubts of the authenticity of the canons of this council, see Mich. Geddes diss. de Sardicensibus canon. in his miscell. tract. T. ii. p. 415. Sarpi in Le Bret's Magazin für Staaten und Kirchengesch. Th. i. (Ulm 1771) S. 429 ff. Comp. Le Bret's remarks on the same point, p. 435 ff.

[8] Accounts of it in favour of Damasus Rufinus eccl. ii. 10. Hieron. chron. ad ann. 366. Socrates iv. 29, in favour of Ursicinus Faustini et Marcellini libellus precum ad Impp. in bibl. PP. Lugd. v. 637. Comp. Ammianus Marcellinus xxvii. 3. See above not. 2.

[9] See the imperial edicts in Baronius 368, no. 2, 369 no. 3.

terness between two parties; *Gratian* gave Damasus the right of judging in the case of condemned bishops,[10] in order that the schismatic clergy might not be at the mercy of worldly, and for the most part as yet, heathen officers.[11] At the same time, the emperor, at the instance of a Roman synod (378), assured him of the support of the civil power as far as it might be necessary for the bishop's purpose.[12] Both privileges conferred on Julius and Damasus were transitory, as well as the relations which gave rise to them.[13] The rights of provincial synods remained

[10] Maximin, a heathen (Amm. Marcell. xxviii. 1), had been so enraged, ita ut causa ad clericorum usque tormenta duceretur (Rufin. h. e. ii. 10).

[11] Epist. Romani Concilii ad Gratian. et Valentin. Impp. A.D. 378 (first published in J. Sirmondi appendix Cod. Theodos. Paris. 1631. 8, p. 78. Mansi iii. 624 ap. Coustant among the epistles of Damasus as ep. 6): a principio—statuistis ad redintegrandum corpus Ecclesiae, quod furor Ursini diversas secuerat in partes, ut auctore damnato, caeterisque—a perditi conjunctione divulsis, de reliquis ecclesiarum sacerdotibus Episcopus Romanus haberet examen: ut et de religione religionis pontifex cum consortibus judicaret, nec ulla fieri videretur injuria sacerdotio, si sacerdos nulli usquam profani judicis, quod plerumque contingere poterat, arbitrio facile subjaceret.

[12] The synod (see the epist. referred to in note 11) proposed no new regulation: statuti imperialis non novitatem, sed firmitudinem postulamus. Hence the following rescript, like the earlier one, referred only to the peculiar relations of the time. In this rescript appended to the epist. already alluded to, Gr. et Val. ad Aquilinum Vicar. Urbis, we find these words, c. 6: Volumus autem, ut quicunque judicio Damasi, quod ille cum consilio quinque vel septem habuerit Episcoporum, vel eorum, qui catholici sunt, judicio vel concilio condemnatus fuerit, si injuste voluerit ecclesiam retentare: ut qui evocatus ad sacerdotale judicium per contumaciam non ivisset, aut ab illustribus viris praefectis praetorio Galliae atque Italiae, sive a proconsulibus vel vicariis, auctoritate adhibita, ad episcopale judicium remittatur, vel ad urbem Romam sub prosecutione perveniat: aut si in longinquioribus partibus alicujus ferocitas talis emerserit, omnis ejus causae dictio ad Metropolitae in eadem provincia Episcopi deducatur examen, vel si ipse Metropolitanus est, Romam necessario, vel ad eos, quos Romanus Episcopus judices dederit, sine delatione contendat, ita tamen, ut quicunque dejecti sunt, ab ejus tantum urbis finibus segregentur, in quibus fuerint sacerdotes. Minus enim graviter meritos coercemus, et sacrilegam pertinaciam lenius quam meretur ulciscimur. Quod si vel Metropolitani Episcopi vel cujuscunque sacerdotis iniquitas est suspecta, aut gratia: ad Romanum Episcopum vel ad concilium quindecim Episcoporum finitimorum accersitum liceat provocare: modo ne post examen habitum quod definitum fuerit integretur.

[13] That the canons of the council of Sardica were never applied in practice is shown by de Marca de conc. Sac. et Impp. lib. vii. c. 11 et 12.

still inviolate, and their decrees were considered as binding even by the bishop of Rome.[14] A permanent kind of influence was opened up to the latter by the custom of referring questions about apostolic doctrine and practices to the bishop of the only apostolic and common mother-church,[15] which happened all the more readily[16] as similar questions were also referred to distinguished bishops in the east.[17] If it was usual in the latter case, so much the more would it occur in the former, especially as it

[14] So Siricius replied (392) to Anysius, bishop of Thessalonica, and to the other bishops in Illyria, when they had asked advice from him respecting Bonosus (Siricii ep. 9 ap. Coustant, erroneously given among the epistles of Ambrose, as ep. 79, and also falsely ascribed to Damasus, see Coustantii monitum): Cum hujusmodi fuerit concilii Capuensis judicium, ut finitimi Bonoso atque ejus accusatoribus judices tribuerentur, et praecipue Macedones, qui cum Episcopo Thessalonicensi de ejus factis vel cognoscerent: advertimus, quod nobis judicandi forma competere non posset. Nam si integra esset hodie synodus, recte de iis, quae comprehendit vestrorum scriptorum series, decerneremus. Vestrum est igitur, qui hoc recepistis judicium, sententiam ferre de omnibus, nec refugiendi vel elabendi vel accusatoribus vel accusato copiam dare. Vicem enim synodi recepistis, quos ad examinandum synodus elegit. Ambrose replied to Bonosus: omnia modeste, patienter, ordine gerenda, neque contra sententiam vestram tentandum aliquid; ut quod videretur vobis justitiae convenire, statueretis, quibus hanc synodus dederat auctoritatem. Ideo primum est, ut ii judicent, quibus judicandi facultas est data: vos enim totius, ut scripsimus, synodi vice decernitis; nos quasi ex synodi auctoritate judicare non convenit.

[15] Comp. the epistolae canonicae Div. i. preface to § 71, as similar ones were also issued in this period by the Alexandrian bishops Athanasius, Timothy, and Theophilus, and by Basil the Great, bishop of Caesarea.

[16] But not exclusively, cf. Conc. Carthagin. iii. (ann. 397) c. 48 (Mansi iii. 891): De Donatistis placuit, ut consulamus fratres et consacerdotes nostros Siricium (bishop of Rome) et Simplicianum (bishop of Milan) de solis infantibus, qui baptizantur penes eosdem, num—parentum illos error impediat, ne provehantur sacri altaris ministri. We have here at the same time a proof of the fact that they considered themselves bound by such opinions as well as by a decision given by arbiters. The two bishops had answered in the affirmative; but when afterwards the deficiency of priests in Africa made another rule desirable, the Conc. African. ann. 401 (Mansi iv. 482) resolved previously to send an embassy ad transmarinas Italiae partes, ut tam sanctis fratribus et consacerdotibus nostris, venerabili sancto fratri Anastasio, sedis apostolicae Episcopo, quam etiam sancto fratri Venerio, sacerdoti Mediolanensis Ecclesiae, necessitatem ipsam ac dolorem atque inopiam nostram valeat intimare (ex his enim sedibus hoc fuerat prohibitum): quo noverint communi periculo providendum, maxime quia tanta indigentia clericorum est, &c.

[17] Innocentii i. ep. 25. ad Decentium A.D. 416 ap. Coustant, ap. Mansi

was customary before this time to consider the current laws of Rome as a standard in doubtful cases of civil jurisprudence.[18] Hence the Roman bishops took occasion to issue a great number of didactic letters (epistolae decretales),[19] which soon assumed the tone of apostolic ordinances, and were held in very high estimation in the west, as flowing from apostolic tradition. All these circumstances had the effect of bringing about such a state of things, that in the beginning of the fifth century the Roman bishops could so early lay claim to a certain oversight of the western church.[20]

iii. 1028: Quis enim nesciat, aut non advertat, id quod a principe Apostolorum Petro Romanae Ecclesiae traditum est, ac nunc usque custoditur, ab omnibus debere servari; nec superduci aut introduci aliquid, quod auctoritatem non habeat, aut aliunde accipere videatur exemplum? Praesertim cum sit manifestum, in omnem Italiam, Gallias, Hispanias, Africam atque Siciliam, et insulas interjacentes, nullum instituisse Ecclesias, nisi eos, quos venerabilis Apostolus Petrus aut ejus successores constituerint sacerdotes. Aut legant, si in his provinciis alius Apostolorum invenitur, aut legitur docuisse. Qui si non legunt, quia nusquam inveniunt, oportet eos hoc sequi, quod Ecclesia Romana custodit, a qua eos principium accepisse non dubium est; ne, dum peregrinis assertionibus student, caput institutionum videantur omittere. Ambrose, however, says of the practice of feet-washing, which did not prevail at Rome, but in Milan most probably, de sacramentis iii. 1: In omnibus cupio sequi Ecclesiam Romanam: sed tamen et nos homines sensum habemus: ideo quod alibi rectius servatur, et nos recte custodimus.

[18] Digest. i. tit. 3. l. 32: De quibus causis scriptis legibus non utimur, id custodiri oportet, quod moribus et consuetudine inductum est: et si qua in re hoc deficeret, tunc quod proximum et consequens ei est: si nec id quidem appareat, tunc jus, quo urbs Roma utitur, servari oportet.

[19] The first existing decretal is Siricii epist. ad Himerium Episc. Tarraconensem A.D. 385, but it refers to missa ad provincias a venerandae memoriae praedecessore meo Liberio generalia decreta. The expression epist. decretalis first appears in the so-called decretum Gelasii de libris recipiendis et non recip. about 500. The original designation is decretum, afterwards statutum, or constitutum decretale. Decretum in the original sources of Roman law means the decision of a college (decretum pontificum, Senatus &c.). So also in the Christian church it denotes the decision of a synod (ex. gr. Conc. Carthag. ann. 397 in fine) or of a presbytery. When such decrees proceed from the Roman presbytery or Roman synods, they are also to be looked upon as decreta. Comp. Spittler's Gesch. des kanon. Rechts dis auf die Zeiten des falschen Isidorus. Halle 1778. S. 157 ff.

[20] Innocentii i. ep. 2. ad Victricium § 6: Si majores causae in medium fuerint devolutae, ad sedem apostolicam, sicut synodus statuit, et beata consuetudo exigit, post judicium episcopale referantur. Ejusd. ep. 29. ad Carthag. Concil. (among Augustine's Epistles ep. 181) § 1: patres

The *eastern* bishops, it is true, would not allow the least interference of the western in their ecclesiastical affairs. They gave a decided repulse to Julius I., when, at the head of the western bishops, he wished to interfere on behalf of the persecuted Athanasius.[21] The fundamental principle of the mutual in-

non humana sed divina decrevere sententia, ut quidquid quamvis de disjunctis remotisque provinciis ageretur, non prius ducerent finiendum, nisi ad hujus sedis notitiam perveniret. The text to which these places refer is epist. Syn. Sardic. ad Julium above not. 6. That the interpretation extends the sense very much is obvious, doubtless in consequence of the progress and development of new circumstances.

[21] The synod of Antioch (341) had first complained to Julius of his conduct in not regarding the sentence of the eastern church. Extracts from this letter are found in Sozomenus iii. 8. Among other things they had said, φέρειν μὲν γὰρ πᾶσι φιλοτιμίαν τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίαν, ὡς ἀποστόλων φροντιστήριον, καὶ εὐσεβείας μητρόπολιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς γεγεννημένην·—οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο δὲ τὰ δευτερεῖα φέρειν ἠξίουν, ὅτι μὴ μεγέθει ἢ πλήθει ἐκκλησίας πλεονεκτοῦσιν, ὡς ἀρετῇ καὶ προαιρέσει νικῶντες κ. τ. λ. The answer to this Julii I. ep. ad Syn. Antiochenam (ap. Athanasius apol. contra Arian. c. 21 ss. Mansi ii. 1211. Coustant-Schoenemann p. 210 ss.): After having shown the irregularity of the proceedings against Athanasius and Marcellus, he says at the conclusion: Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ὅλως, ὡς φατὲ, γέγονέ τι εἰς αὐτοὺς ἁμάρτημα, ἔδει κατὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κανόνα, καὶ μὴ οὕτως γεγενῆσθαι τὴν κρίσιν· ἔδει γραφῆναι πᾶσιν ἡμῖν, ἵνα οὕτως παρὰ πάντων ὁρισθῇ τὸ δίκαιον. ἐπίσκοποι γὰρ ἦσαν οἱ πάσχοντες, καὶ οὐχ αἱ τυχοῦσαι ἐκκλησίαι αἱ πάσχουσαι, ἀλλ' ὧν αὐτοὶ οἱ Ἀπόστολοι δι' ἑαυτῶν καθηγήσαντο. Διατί δὲ περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐκκλησίας μάλιστα οὐκ ἐγράφετο ἡμῖν; ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι τοῦτο ἔθος ἦν, πρότερον γράφεσθαι ἡμῖν, καὶ οὕτως ἔνθεν ὁρίζεσθαι τὰ δίκαια; Εἰ μὲν οὖν τι τοιοῦτον ἦν ὑποπτευθὲν εἰς τὸν ἐπίσκοπον τὸν ἐκεῖ, ἔδει πρὸς τὴν ἐνταῦθα ἐκκλησίαν γραφῆναι. Julius, therefore, did not pretend to pronounce judgment on Athanasius and Marcellus alone, but in conjunction with all the bishops (comp. below note 26). This demand grew out of the western notions respecting the superior dignity of the bishops of apostolic communities (see above note 5), as those two were. See de Marca de concord. Sac. et Imp. lib. vii. c. 4. § 2. 6 ss. On the other hand the orientals reply in the epist. synodalis Sardicensis (Philippopoli habitae) ad Donatum (in Hilarii fragm. lib. ii. ap. Mansi iii. 136): Hanc novitatem moliebantur inducere, quam horret vetus consuetudo ecclesiae, ut in concilio orientales Episcopi quidquid forte statuissent, ab Episcopis occidentalibus refricaretur: similiter quidquid occidentalium partium Episcopi, ab orientalibus solveretur. Sed hoc ex illo suo pravissimo sensu tractabant. Verum omnium conciliorum juste legitimeque actorum decreta firmanda, majorum nostrorum gesta consignant. Nam in urbe Roma sub Novato et Sabellio et Valentino haereticis factum concilium, ab Orientalibus confirmatum est: et iterum in oriente sub Paulo a Samosatis quod statutum est, ab omnibus est signatum.—Nos vero nulli injuriam facimus, sed legis praecepta servamus. Nam injuriati et male tractati sumus ab iis qui volebant ecclesiae catholicae regulam sua pravitate turbare: sed ante oculos habentes timorem Dei, judicium Christi,

dependence of the occidental and oriental church, was universally maintained in the east.[22] Still the period of the doctrinal controversies had a very important influence in promoting the power of the Roman bishop. The speculative questions which split the east into factions excited little interest in the west. On this very account the Westerns united very soon and easily in the opinion to be embraced, in which they chiefly followed the bishop of Rome, who was almost the only organ of communication with the east,[23] and by means of whom they also became acquainted with its controversies. Thus in all these controversies the west stood united and stedfast, with the bishop of Rome at its head, in contrast with the east split into parties and wavering; and when matters came to a final decision, it turned the scale in the balance of parties, though merely as a sluggish mass. This phenomenon, which was constantly reappearing, was first manifested in the final victory of the Nicene faith. When these doctrines began to spread in the east likewise, under Valens, it is true the new Nicene orientals could not entirely unite with the west, and believed that they had much reason to complain of the arrogance of the westerns;[24] but yet the west was their

verum et justum considerantes, nullius personam accepimus, neque alicui pepercimus, quo minus ecclesiasticam disciplinam servaremus. Unde Julium urbis Romae, Osium et Protogenem, et Gaudentium et Maximinum a Treveris damnavit omne concilium secundum antiquissimam legem: Julium vero urbis Romae, ut principem et ducem malorum, qui primus januam communionis sceleratis atque damnatis aperuit, ceterisque aditum fecit ad solvenda jura divina, defendebatque Athanasium praesumentur atque audaciter, hominem, cujus nec testes noverat, nec accusatores.

[22] Constantii Imp. ep. ad Syn. Ariminensem A.D. 359 (ap. Mansi iii. 297): Non enim de orientalibus Episcopis in concilio vestro patitur ratio aliquid definiri. Proinde super his tantum, quae ad vos pertinere cognoscit gravitas vestra, tractare debebitis.—Quae cum ita sint, adversus orientales nihil statuere vos oportet, aut si aliquid volueritis contra eosdem praedictis absentibus definire, id quod fuerit usurpatum irrito evanesceet effectu. At the Concil. Aquilejense ann. 381 Palladius being accused of Arianism replied (Mansi iii. 602): Absentibus sacerdotibus nostris nos respondere non possumus. Ambrosius Episcopus dixit: Qui sunt consortes vestri? Palladius dixit: Orientales Episcopi.—cf. Leo Allatius de Eccles. occid. et orient. perp. consens. lib. i. c. 10. Concerning the appeals from the east to Rome, see de Marca de concord. Sac. et Imp. lib. vii. c. 6—10. Du Pin de ant. eccl. discipl. p. 156 ss.

[23] Augustin. contra Cresconium iii. 34: ad Carthaginis Episcopum Romano praetermisso nunquam orientalis catholica scribit.

[24] Basil respecting the δυτικὴ ὁρμή above § 83, not. 34.

only stay and support in opposition to all other parties. And though *the council of Constantinople* (381), afterwards arranged the affairs of the oriental church without any reference to the west, and even openly took the part of the Miletians, whom the occidentals had rejected;[25] and not long after the interference of the Italian bishops in the matter of the rival bishop of Constantinople, *Maximus*, was entirely disregarded;[26] yet it could not but be seen, that in the great theological question of the day occidental stedfastness had obtained the victory over the wavering east. But whatever influence the west gained in the east, it gained only for the reputation of the Roman bishop,[27] who, at the head of the west, was the only organ of direct communication with the east. From this time forth there was no important ecclesiastical controversy in the east in which each party did not endeavour to gain over the bishop of Rome, and through him the west, to its side;[28] for which purpose both flatteries were

[25] See above § 83, not. 34.

[26] Epist. ii. Concilii Italiae ad Theodos. Imp. (prim. ed. in J. Sirmondi app. Cod. Theod. p. 105, ap. Mansi iii. 631): revera advertebamus, Gregorium nequaquam secundum traditionem patrum Constantinopolitanae ecclesiae sibi sacerdotium vindicare.—At eo ipso tempore, qui generale concilium declinaverunt, Constantinopoli quae gessisse dicuntur. Nam quum cognovissent, ad hoc partium venisse Maximum, ut causam in synodo ageret suam, quod etiamsi indictum concilium non fuisset, jure et more majorum, sicut et sanctae memoriae Athanasius, et dudum Petrus Alexandrinae ecclesiae episcopi, et orientalium plerique fecerunt, ut ad ecclesiae Romanae, Italiae, et totius Occidentis confugisse judicium viderentur;—praestolari utique etiam nostram super eo sententiam debuerunt. Non praerogitavam vindicamus examinis, sed consortium tamen debuit esse communis arbitrii.—Nectarium autem cum nuper nostra mediocritas Constantinopoli cognoverit ordinatum, cohaerere communionem nostram cum orientalibus partibus non videmus.—Nec videmus eam posse aliter convenire, nisi aut is reddatur Constantinopoli qui prior est ordinatu, aut certe super duorum ordinatione sit in urbe Roma nostrum orientaliumque concilium. The Orientals replied to this in the Synodica Conc. Constantinop. ann. 382 ad Occidentales (ap. Theodoret v. c. 9.); *περὶ δὲ τῶν οἰκονομιῶν τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, παλαιός τε, ὡς ἴστε, δεσμὸς κεκράτηκε, καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἐν Νικαίᾳ πατέρων ὅρος, καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν τοὺς τῆς ἐπαρχίας—ποιεῖσθαι τὰς χειροτονίας. Οἷς ἀκολούθως—τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει—ἐκκλησίας—Νεκτάριον ἐπίσκοπον κεχειροτονήκαμεν.—οἷς ὡς ἐνδέσμως καὶ κανονικῶς παρ' ἡμῖν κεκρατηκόσι, καὶ τὴν ὑμετέραν συγχαίρειν παρακαλοῦμεν εὐλάβειαν.*

[27] The *κορυφαῖος τῶν δυτικῶν* § 83, not. 20, comp. Theod. xvi. 1, 2, § 83, not. 32.

[28] Socrates ii. 8, says that there was no Roman legate at the council of Antioch *καίτοι κανόνος ἐκκλεσιαστικοῦ κελεύοντος, μὴ δεῖν ταρά τὴι γνώ-*

applied, and a presumptuous tone submitted to.[29] At the councils, his legates were treated with peculiar deference. Chalcedon was the first general council where they presided.[30]

As the west was accustomed to estimate the dignity of the episcopal seat according to its apostolic derivation,[31] and since the decrees of the council of Sardica imparted certain privileges to the Roman see out of deference to the apostle Peter; so also the Romish bishops derived all their claims to distinction from the fact that they were the successors of Peter.[32] At the same time, they opposed the opinion universally adopted in the east,

μην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης τὰς ἐκκλησίας κανονίζειν. He borrows this sentence expressly ii. 17, from Julii ep. ad Syn. Antioch. (see above not. 21,) and has therefore understood Julius as if he had meant: τοῦτο ἔθος ἦν, πρότερον γράφεσθαι ἡμῖν, καὶ οὕτως ἔνθεν ὁρίζεσθαι τὰ δίκαια, in which Sozomen iii. 10, also finds too much when he gives as its sense: εἶναι γὰρ νόμον ἱερατικὸν, ὡς ἄκυρα ἀποφαίνειν τὰ παρὰ γνώμην πραττόμενα τοῦ Ῥωμαίων ἐπισκόπου (de Marca lib. v. c. 12, § 1). Still the practice of the church in the fifth century must have given rise to such an amplifying mode of interpretation. That there was no law in existence such as these two writers refer to, is plain from Can. Constant. 3, (above § 93, not. 9) and Chalced. 28, (§ 93, not. 14): the mystery is explained by the connexion already pointed out in § 93—.Moreover, we have here a remarkable proof of the manner in which interpretations, very much extended and heaped upon one another, have obtained an influence over the constitution of the church as progressively developed and formed. That passage of Socrates is translated in the Historia tripartita iv. 9, ap. 19: non debere absque sententia Romani Pontificis Concilia celebrari. Hence Pseudoisidore has borrowed this sentence from him countless times, and at length introduced it into the practice of the church.

[29] Comp. the Commonitorium (instructions) of the Roman legates for the council at Ephesus 431, ap. Mansi iv. 556: Ad fratrem et coëpiscopum nostrum Cyrillum consilium vestrum omne convertite, et quicquid in ejus videritis arbitrio, facietis. Et auctoritatem sedis apostolicae custodiri debere mandamus.—Ad disceptationem si fuerit ventum, vos de eorum sententiis judicare debeatis, non subire certamem.

[30] On presidency at the general councils of this time see de Marca lib. v. c. 3—c. 6, ap. Boehmeri observ. ad haec cap. p. 113 ss. Launoji epistt. lib. viii. ep. 1—6. J. U. Cramer on J. U. Bossuet's Gesch. d. Welt. Th. 1, S. 612 ff. Planck's Geschichte der. kirchl. Gesellschaftsverf. Bd. 1, S. 683 ff.

[31] See above not. 5.

[32] On the original signification of Vicarius Petri, see Cypriani ep. 67, ad Steph. Ep. Rom. Servandus est enim antecessorum nostrorum beatorum martyrum Cornelii et Lucii honor gloriosus: quorum memoriam cum nos honoremus, multo magis tu, frater carissime, honorificare—debes, qui vicarius et successor eorum factus es. Suidas and Phavorinus explain Βικάριος by διάδοχος.

that they and the other patriarchs owed their elevation merely to the importance of the cities in which they resided;[33] and therefore they set themselves so much against the privileges of the bishop of Constantinople, which rested only on this ground. But though, on tracing back their claims, they supported the normal authority of their church on the basis of its apostolic origin, and its parental relation to the whole western church,[34] they acknowledged notwithstanding, that the peculiar privileges of their see did not originally belong to it, but had been granted by the fathers.[35] On the idea of Peter having been the first apostle they could hardly found any particular pre-eminence in the fourth century, since there was conceded to him only a *primatus honoris*, in so far as Christ had first given him alone those rights which he afterwards transferred to all the apostles, and through them to all bishops equally.[36] And as, according to

[33] Epist. Innocentii ad Alexandrum Episc. Antioch. about 415. (ap. Coustant ep. Innoc. 24): Revolventes itaque auctoritatem Nicenae synodi, quae una omnium per orbem terrarum mentem explicat sacerdotum, quae censuit de Antiochena ecclesia cunctis fidelibus, ne dixerim sacerdotibus, esse necessarium custodire, qua super diocesin suam praedictam ecclesiam, non super aliquam provinciam recognoscimus constitutam. Unde advertimus, non tam pro civitatis magnificentia hoc eidem attributum, quam quod prima primi apostoli sedes esse monstretur, ubi et nomen accepit religio christiana, et quae conventum Apostolorum apud se fieri celeberrimum meruit, quaeque urbis Romae sedi non cederet, nisi quod illa in transitu meruit, ista susceptum apud se consummatumque gauderet. The same principle was applied in Rome itself to the Metropolitans. Ibid. Quod sciscitaris, utrum divisis imperiali judicio provinciis, ut duae metropoles fiant, sic duo metropolitani episcopi debeant nominari; non esse e re visum est, ad mobilitatem necessitatum mundanarum Dei ecclesiam commutari.

[34] Innocentii i. ep. 25, ad Decentium see above not. 17.

[35] See above not. 20. Zosimi ep. 2, ad Episc. Afr. § 1: His accedit apostolicae sedis auctoritas, cui in honorem beatissimi Petri patrum decreta peculiarem quandam sanxere reverentiam. Valentiniani iii. ep. ad Theodosium Aug. A.D. 450, (among Leonis M. epistt. ed Ballerini ep. 55): ὁ μακαριώτατος ἐπισκοπος τῆς Ῥωμαίων πόλεως, ᾧ τὴν ἱερωσύνην κατὰ πάντων ἡ ἀρχαιότης παρέσχε.

[36] In the passage Matth. xvi. 18, πέτρα was usually explained as meaning the confession of Peter, (Hilary, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose, Chrysostom, &c.) or Christ (Jerome, Augustine,) less frequently, the person of Peter (Hieron. ep. 14, al. 57, ad Damasum). cf. Casauboni exercit. ad Baron. xv. num. 13 ss. Suicer thes. eccl. s. v. πέτρα. Du Pin de ant. eccl. discipl. diss. iv. c. 1, § 1. But as to St Matthew xvi. 19, the old view was universally maintained, (see Div. i. § 68, not. 10). Optatus Milev. lib. vii.: Praeferri Petrus caeteris Apostolis meruit, et claves regni caelorum communicandas caeteris solus accepit. Ambrosii

this view, men did not scruple to attribute precisely the same dignity and authority to several of the other apostles,[37] the bi-

de incarnatione Domini c. 4: (Petrus) ubi audivit: vos autem quid me dicitis? statim loci non immemor sui primatum egit: primatum confessionis utique, non honoris, primatum fidei, non ordinis. Hoc est dicere: nunc nemo me vincat, nunc meae partes sunt, debeo compensare quod tacui, &c. Augustinus de diversis serm. 108: Has enim claves non homo unus, sed unitas accepit ecclesiae. Hinc ergo Petri excellentia praedicatur, quia ipsius universitatis et unitatis ecclesiae figuram gessit, quando ei dictum est: tibi trado, quod omnibus traditum est. Nam ut noveritis, ecclesiam accepisse claves regni caelorum, audite in alio loco, quid Dominus dicat omnibus Apostolis suis: accepite Sp. s. et continuo: si cui dimiseritis peccata, dimittentur ei, sicui tenueritis, tenebuntur.—Idem in Evang. Joannis tract. 124, § 5: Ecclesiae Petrus Apostolus propter Apostolatus sui primatum gerebat figurata generalitate personam.—Quando ei dictum est: Tibi dabo claves regni caelorum caet., universam significabat Ecclesiam, quae in hoc saeculo diversis tentationibus—quatitur, et non cadit. quoniam fundata est super petram, unde Petrus nomen accepit, non enim a Petro petra, sed Petrus a petra, sicut non Christus a Christiano, sed Christianus a Christo vocatur. Ideo quippe ait Dominus: super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam, quia dixerat Petrus: Tu es Christus Filius Dei vivi. Super hanc ergo, inquit, petram, quam confessus es, aedificabo ecclesiam meam. Petra enim erat Christus, super quod fundamentum etiam ipse aedificatus est Petrus. —Ecclesia ergo, quae fundatur in Christo, claves ab eo regni caelorum accepit, in Petro i. e. potestatem ligandi solvendique peccata. Hieronymus in Amos vi. 12: petra Christus est, qui donavit Apostolis suis, ut ipse quoque petrae vocentur: Tu es Petrus, &c.—Hieronymus adv. Jovinian. lib. i.: At dicis: super Petrum fundatur ecclesia: licit idipsum in alio loco super omnes Apostolos fiat, et cuncti claves regni caelorum accipiant, et ex aequo super eos fortitudo Ecclesiae solidetur, tamen propterea unus eligitur, ut capite constituto schismatis tollatur occasio. Cf. du Pin l. c. diss. vi. § 1. Launoji epistt. lib. ii. ep. 5. Hence all bishops were considered the successors of Peter: Siricii ep. 5 ad Episc. Africae § 1 and Innocentius i. ep. 2 § 2: per Petrum et Apostolatus et Episcopatus in Christo cepit exordium. Innocentius i. ep. 29 ad Concil. Carthag. § 1: a Petro ipse Episcopatus et tota auctoritas nominis hujus emersit. Augustini sermo 296 § 11: Ergo commendavit nobis Dominus oves suas, quia Petro commendavit. Gaudentii sermo die ordinationis habitus: Ambrosius—tanquam Petri Apostoli successor. Cf. Baluzii not. ad Servatum Lupum (ed. Paris 1664) p. 422 ss.

[37] Especially Paul: Ambrosii sermo ii. in festo Petri et Pauli (sermo 66, is also met with as Augustini de Sanctis sermo and Maximi Taurinensis sermo 54): Ergo beati Petrus et Paulus eminent inter universos Apostolos, et peculiari quadam praerogativa praecellunt. Verum inter ipsos, quis cui praeponatur, incertum est. Puto enim illos aequales esse meritis, qui aequales sunt passione. Et in quo tandem loco iidem martyrium pertulerunt? In urbe Roma, quae principatum et caput obtinet nationum: scilicet ut, ubi caput superstitionis erat, illic caput quiesceret sanctitatis; et ubi gentilium principes habitabant, illic ecclesiarum prin-

shop of Rome could the less pretend to have inherited from Peter a peculiar spiritual power reaching beyond that of the other bishops.[38]

But after the rights of the Romish bishops had become older in the west, and their authority had been so much increased in the east likewise since the end of the Arian controversy, they began at Rome in like proportion to enlarge the notion of Peter's primacy, and to regard all the honours and rights of the

cipes morerentur. So too idem de Spir. Sancto ii. c. 12: Nec Paulus inferior Petro, quamvis ille Ecclesiae fundamentum (Matth. xvi. 18), et hic sapiens architectus sciens vestigia credentium fundare populorum (1 Cor. iii. 10). Nec Paulus, inquam, indignus Apostolorum collegio cum primo quoque facile conferendus, et nulli secundus: nam qui se imparem nescit, facit aequalem (Gal. ii. 7 ss.) Augustinus de Sanctis sermo 25: Etsi Petrum priorem, tamen ambos ditavit honore uno. Gaudentius serm. de Petro et Paulo: Quem cui praeponere audeam nescio. Ambrosiaster ad Gal. ii. 11: Nam quis eorum auderet Petro primo Apostolo, cui claves regni caelorum Dominus dedit, resistere, nisi alius talis, qui fiducia electionis suae sciens se non imparem, constanter improbaret, quod ille sine consilio fecerat? In Theodoret's comm. in epistt. Pauli, the commentary on Gal. ii. 6—14 has been erased in the Codices hitherto in use, without doubt, by Latinising Greeks (see Noesselti corollarium to the praef. in Theodoreti opp. T. iii. Halle edition). Out of these and similar passages arose the remarkable view of Antoine Arnauld, that Peter and Paul were alike the heads of the church (see de l'autorité de St Pierre et de St Paul, résidant dans le Pape leur successeur. Paris 1645. 8. and de la grandeur l'église Rom. établie sur l'autorité de saint Pierre et saint Paul. Paris 1645., the first work by Arnauld, the second by Martin de Barcos), a doctrine which the Romish inquisition, 1647, condemned as Jansenite. See Ittigii diss. de origine controversiae circa aequalem Petri et Pauli primatum in his heptas dissertt., annexed to the dissertt. de haeresiarchis aevi apostolici p. 401 ss. Other apostles, however, were also made equal to Peter. Hieronymus in Psalm 67. calls Petrum et Andream Apostolorum principes. Cyrilli et Syn. Alexandr. epist. ad Nestorium § 5 (in actis Conc. Ephes. ap. Mansi iv. 1073): Πέτρος τε καὶ Ἰωάννης ἰσότιμοι ἀλλήλοις. Concerning James see below not. 40.

[38] Hieron. epist. 101 (al. 85) ad Evangelum: Nec altera Romanae urbis ecclesia, altera totius orbis existimanda est. Et Galliae, et Britanniae, et Africa, et Persis, et Oriens, et India, et omnes barbarae nationes unum Christum adorant: unam observant regulam veritatis. Si auctoritas quaeritur, orbis major est urbe. Ubicunque fuerit Episcopus, sive Romae, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegii, sive Alexandriae, sive Tanis: ejusdem meriti, ejusdem est et sacerdotii. Potentia divitiarum et paupertatis humilitas vel sublimiorem vel inferiorem Episcopum non facit. Caeterum omnes Apostolorum successores sunt. Sed dicis, quomodo Romae ad testimonium diaconi presbyter ordinatur? Quid mihi profers unius urbis consuetudinem? Quid paucitatem, de qua ortum est supercilium, in leges ecclesiae vindicas? &c.

Romish bishop as inherited from Peter,[39] a view which appears first to have been fully developed by Leo. In the east, they could not go in with this representation, because there they were accustomed to attribute the primacy to the church of Jerusalem and James, at least during the first century.[40] In Jerusalem itself they endeavoured even now to establish the hierarchical claims of the whole church on the rank of the mother church;[41] but in the external insignificance of this see little stress could be laid on these claims, especially since the authority of churches generally, in the east, was not determined according to their original importance, but the political rank of the cities in which they existed.[42]

[39] Thus the Persian legates at the Conc. Ephesin. ann. 431. ex. gr. actio iii. (Mansi iv. 1296): Οὐδενὶ ἀμφίβολόν ἐστι, μᾶλλον δὲ πᾶσι τοῖς αἰῶσιν ἐγνώσθη, ὅτι ὁ ἅγιος καὶ μακαριώτατος Πέτρος, ὁ ἔξαρχος καὶ κεφαλὴ τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὁ κίων τῆς πίστεως, ὁ θεμέλιος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—τὰς κλεῖς τῆς βασιλείας ἐδέξατο· καὶ αὐτῷ δέδοται ἐξουσία τοῦ δεσμεῖν καὶ λύειν ἁμαρτίας· ὅστις ἕως τοῦ νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ διαδόχοις καὶ ζῇ, καὶ δικάζει.

[40] Hesychii presb. Hierosolym. († 343) ap. Photius cod. 275: πῶς ἐγκωμιάσω τὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλον καὶ ἀδελφὸν, τὸν τῆς νέας Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἀρχιστράτηγον, τὸν τῶν ἱερέων ἡγεμόνα, τῶν ἀποστόλων τὸν ἔξαρχον, τὴν ἐν κεφαλαῖς κορυφὴν, τὸν ἐν λύχνοις ὑπερλάμποντα, τὸν ἐν ἄστροις ὑπερφαίνοντα; Πέτρος δημηγορεῖ, ἀλλ' Ἰάκωβος νομοθετεῖ, καὶ ὀλίγαι λέξεις τὸ τοῦ ζητήματος συνέστειλαν μέγεθος· "ἐγὼ κρίνω μὴ παρενοχλεῖν τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν" καὶ ἑξῆς (Act. xv. 19). Epiphanius haer. lxx. c. 10: ἔχρην τότε τῶν Ἐπισκόπων ἐκ περιτομῆς ὄντων ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ καταστάντων τὸν πάντα κόσμον τούτοις συνέπεσθαι,—ἵνα μία τις γένηται συμφωνία, καὶ μία ὁμολογία. haer. lxxviii. § 7: καὶ πρῶτος οὗτος (Ἰάκωβος) εἴληφε τὴν καθέδραν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, ᾧ πεπίστευκε κύριος τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς πρώτῳ, ὃς καὶ ἐκαλεῖτο ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου. Chrysostomus hom. 33. in Acta Apost. cap. 15. praises James in allowing Peter and Paul to speak first, though himself τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐγκεχειρισμένος. In the προσφώνησις ὑπὲρ τῶν πιστῶν Constitutt. Apostol. viii. c. 10. the prayers for the three most distinguished bishops follow each other in this order: ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ἡμῶν Ἰακώβου καὶ τῶν παροικιῶν αὐτοῦ δεηθῶμεν· ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ἡμῶν Κλήμεντος καὶ τῶν παροικιῶν αὐτοῦ δεηθῶμεν· ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ἡμῶν Εὐοδίου καὶ τῶν παροικιῶν αὐτοῦ δεηθῶμεν.

[41] Juvenalis Episc. Hieros. in Conc. Ephes. act. iv. (ap. Mansi iv. 1312): Ἐχρῆν μὲν Ἰωάννην τὸν εὐλαβέστατον ἐπίσκοπον Ἀντιοχείας—τὸν ἀποστολικὸν θρόνον συνεδρεύοντα ἡμῖν τῆς μεγάλης Ῥώμης τιμῆσαι, καὶ τῷ ἀποστολικῷ τῆς Ἱεροσολύμων ἁγίας τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας ὑπακοῦσαι, παρ' ᾧ μάλιστα ἔθος αὐτὸν τῶν Ἀντιοχέων θρόνον ἐξ ἀποστολικῆς ἀκολουθίας καὶ παραδόσεως ἰθύνεσθαι καὶ παρ' αὐτῷ δικάζεσθαι. (In the editions τιμῆσαι is erroneously placed after ὑπακοῦσαι.)

[42] Even Dioscurus sought to elevate the see of Alexandria by appealing to St Mark. Theodoretus ep. 86. ad Flavianum Ep. Constantinop.:

High as was the dignity which the Roman bishops enjoyed in *the west*, their influence was yet very different in the different provinces. They had the full rights of patriarchs only in the diocese of Rome. In the *dioecesis Italiae*, the bishop of *Milan* exercised quite independently of them a hierarchical power similar to that of the patriarchs; in addition to whom the bishop of *Aquileia* also,[43] and at a later period the bishop of *Ravenna*,[44] raised themselves to the rank of independent patriarchs. In the mean time, the Roman bishops, by a skilful use of opportunities, succeeded in attaching *East Illyria* to their patriarchate.[45] During the Arian disputes, Illyria had belonged to the western empire, and the Illyrian church had continued true to the Nicene council,[46] attaching itself to the bishop of Rome for its defence, as did the whole west. When, therefore, Gratian, A.D. 379, divided Illyria, and annexed *Illyricum orientale* to the eastern empire, the bishops of east Illyria, who had for so long a time maintained no communion with the east, could not have much inclination to attach themselves ecclesiastically to the east, during the strife of parties by which it was then distinguished; while the bishop of Thessalonica, the ecclesiastical head of East Illyria, must have been averse to a union of this kind, which would have made him subject to a superior so near, viz. the bishop of Constantinople.

Under these circumstances, it was easy for the Roman bishops to persuade the bishop of Thessalonica to exercise the patriar-

ἄνω καὶ κάτω τοῦ μακαρίου Μάρκου τὸν θρόνον προβάλλεται· καὶ ταῦτα σαφῶς εἰδὼς, ὡς τοῦ μεγάλου Πέτρου τὸν θρόνον ἡ Ἀντιοχέων μεγαλόπολις ἔχει, ὃς καὶ τοῦ μακαρίου Μάρκου διδάσκαλος ἦν, καὶ τοῦ χοροῦ τῶν Ἀποστόλων πρῶτος καὶ κορυφαῖος. Ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς τοῦ μὲν θρόνου τὸ ὕψος ἐπιστάμεθα, ἑαυτοὺς δὲ καὶ γινώσκομεν καὶ μετροῦμεν. τὴν γὰρ ἀποστολικὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην ἄνωθεν μεμαθήκαμεν.

[43] J. F. B. M. de Rubeis monumenta Ecclesiae Aquilejensis. Argentinae 1740. fol. c. 19 et 20. Ziegler's Gesch. d. Kirchl. Verfassungsformen S. 321 ss.

[44] Since Honorius, fleeing from the Goths, had transferred his residence to Ravenna, Zosimus v. 30.

[45] See especially Baluzius in de Marca de concord. Sac. et Imp. v. c. 19. c. 29. and Boehmer's appendix observ. 15 ss.

[46] When Theodosius was baptised (380) by Ascholius bishop of Thessalonica, Sozom. vii. 4: ἤδη δὲ (Θεοδόσιος) καὶ Ἰλλυριοῖς ἅπασι μὴ μεταχοῦσι τοῦ Ἀρείου δόξης· πυνθανόμενος δὲ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν, μέχρι μὲν Μακεδόνων ἔγνω τὰς Ἐκκλησίας ὁμονοεῖν,—ἐντεῦθεν δὲ τὰ πρὸς ἕω στασιάζειν κ. τ. λ.

chal rights, in the new prefecture of east Illyria, as vicar of the Roman see. *Damasus* and *Siricius* made this arrangement; *Innocent I.* looked upon it as already fixed.[47] The east Illyrian bishops, indeed, who by this means were entirely at the mercy of the bishop of Thessalonica, remote as they were from Rome, soon found cause of dissatisfaction; but their attempt to procure the ecclesiastical union of their province with the patriarchate of Constantinople by an imperial law was frustrated.[48]

Another favourable opportunity for extending their power presented itself to the Roman bishops in *Gaul*.[49] When they began to establish metropolitan relations here at the end of the

[47] Innocentii i. ep. 13. ad Rufum Ep. Thessal. Divinitus ergo haec procurrens gratia ita longis intervallis disterminatis a me ecclesiis discat (leg. dictat) consulendum, ut prudentiae gravitatique tuae committendam curam causasque, si quae exoriantur per Achajae, Thessaliae, Epiri veteris, Epiri novae, et Cretae, Daciae mediterraneae, Daciae Ripensis, Moesiae, Dardaniae et Praevali Ecclesias, Christo Domino annuente censeant (leg. censeam).—non primitus haec ita statuentes, sed praecessores nostros apostolicos imitati, qui beatissimis Acholio et Anysio injungi pro eorum meritis ista voluerunt.—Arripe itaque, dilectissime frater, nostra vice per suprascriptas Ecclesias, salvo earum primatu, curam: et inter ipsos primatus primus, quidquid eos ad nos necesse fuerit mittere, non sine tuo postulent arbitratu. Ita enim aut per tuam experientiam quidquid illud est finietur: aut tuo consilio ad nos usque perveniendum esse mandamus. The relation was similar to the political one of a vicar to his praefectus praetorio (see § 93. not. 5).

[48] Cod. Theod. xvi. ii. 45 and Cod. Justin. i. ii. 6: Theodosius Aug. Philippo Pf. P. Illyrici (A.D. 421). Omni innovatione cessante, vetustatem et canones pristinos ecclesiasticos, qui nunc usque tenuerunt, per omnes Illyrici provincias servari praecipimus: ut si quid dubietatis emerserit, id oporteat non absque scientia viri reverendissimi sacrosanctae legis antistitis urbis Constantinopolitanae, quae Romae veteris praerogativa laetatur, conventui sacerdotali sanctoque judicio reservari. At the intercession of Honorius (see Honorii ep. ad Theodos. Aug. among the letters of Boniface I. ap. Coustant ep. 10) Theodosius II. soon after repealed the law (Theodosii ep. ad Honorium ibid. ep. 11): omni supplicantium Episcoporum per Illyricum subreptione remota, statuimus observari quod prisca apostolica disciplina et canones veteres eloquuntur. It is remarkable that this law is found in two codices, but not its repeal. The Roman bishops were compelled continually to exhort the Illyrian bishops to obey the bishop of Thessalonica, cf. Bonifacii I. ep. 14 ad Episcopos per Thessal., ep. 15 ad Episcc. per Macedoniam, Achajam, &c. Sixti iii. ep. 7 ad Perigenem Episc. Corinth., ep. 8 ad Synod. Thessalonicae congregandam. Leonis i. ep. 5 ad Episcc. Metropolitanos per Illyricum constitutos, ep. 13 ad eosdem. (Leo's Leben v. Perthel. S. 21.)

[49] Concerning the Vicariatus Arelatensis see de Marca (Baluzius) l. c. lib. v. c. 30—c. 41.

fourth century,[50] the political principle of the orientals had obtained at first in the distribution of them.[51] The bishop of *Arelate* long endeavoured in vain to make the principle of apostolic origin tell in his favour in opposition to the oriental principle. At last he applied to Rome. *Zosimus*, seizing on the opportunity (417), declared *Patroclus* bishop of *Arelate* his vicar in Gaul, and invested him with metropolitan rights in Viennensis, Nabonensis prima and secunda.[52] The offended metropolitans of Vienne, Narbo, and Massilia, refused, however, to accede to this arrangement in spite of all threats; and when, soon after, the bishop of *Arelate* (418) began to strive after ecclesiastical

[50] Compare the Ballerini observatt. ad Quesnelli diss. v. P. ii. in Ballerinus's edition of the opp. Leonis tom. ii. p. 1030 ss. Ziegler's Gesch. d. Kirchl. Verfassungsformen S. 79 ff.

[51] Conc. Taurinense ann. 491 (according to Baronius erroneously ann. 397) can. 2: Illud deinde inter Episcopos urbium Arelatensis et Viennensis, qui de primatus apud nos honore certabant, a S. Synodo definitum est, ut qui ex eis approbaverit suam civitatem esse metropolim, is totius provinciae honorem primatus obtineat.

[52] Zosimi ep. 1. ad Episcc. Galliae: Placuit apostolicae sedi, ut si quis ex qualibet Galliarum parte, sub quolibet ecclesiastico gradu, ad nos Romam venire contendit, vel alio terrarum ire disponit, non aliter proficiscatur, nisi metropolitani Arelatensis Episcopi formatas acceperit.—Quisquis igitur—praetermissa supradicti formata—ad nos venerit, sciat se omnino suscipi non posse.—Jussimus autem praecipuam, sicuti semper habuit, metropolitanus Episcopus Arelatensium civitatis in ordinandis sacerdotibus teneat auctoritatem. Viennensem, Narbonensem primam et Narbonensem secundam provincias ad pontificium suum revocet. Quisquis vero posthac contra apostolicae sedis statuta et praecepta majorum, omisso metropolitano Episcopo, in provinciis supradictis quemquem ordinare praesumserit, vel is qui ordinari se illicite siverit, uterque sacerdotio se carere cognoscat.—Sane quoniam metropolitanae Arelatensium urbi vetus privilegium minime derogandum est, ad quam primum ex hac sede Trophimus summus antistes, ex cujus fonte totae Galliae fidei rivulos acceperunt, directus est; idcirco quascunque paroecias in quibuslibet territoriis, etiam extra provincias suas, ut antiquitus habuit, intemerata auctoritate possideat. Ad cujus notitiam, si quid illic negotiorum emerserit, referri censemus nisi magnitudo causae etiam nostrum exquirat examen. Ejusd. ep. 5. ad Episc. Prov. Vienn. et Narbon. rejects the decision of the Syn. Taurin. as surreptitiously obtained: Indecens ausus et in ipso vestibulo resecandus, hoc ab Episcopis ob certas causas concilium agitantibus extorquere, quod contra patrum et s. Trophimi reverentiam, qui primus metropolitanus Arelatensis civitatis ex hac sede directus est, concedere vel mutare ne hujus quidem sedis possit auctoritas. Against this assertion of the rights belonging to the church of Arles see below Leo I. not. 56.

dominion over the seven provinces (Septimana),[53] of which his city had been made the chief, the Roman bishops also found it their interest to take part with the old metropolitans.[54] Hilary bishop of *Arelate* finally forgot his duty as vicar so far that he would not allow the sentence of deposition pronounced by him and his synod against *Celidonius* bishop of Vesontio to be submitted to a new examination in Rome.[55] On this account *Leo*

[53] After Treves had been plundered by the Germans, Arelate became the residence of Praefectus praetorio of Gaul, whose dominion extended from this place to seven provinces. See Honorii constitutio ap. Sirmond. in notis ad Sidonium Apoll. and in Codicis Theodosiani libb. v. priores ed. C. F. Chr. Wenck. Lips. 1825. 8. p. 378 ss. Cf. p. 371 ss.

[54] When the clergy and people of Lutuba complained to Boniface I. that Patroclus had forced a bishop upon them, he wrote epist. 12 ad Hilarium Ep. Narbon. A.D. 422: Quod nequaquam possumus ferre patienter sanctionum diligentes esse custodes. Nulli etenim videtur incognita synodi constitutio Nicaenae, quae ita praecepit, per unamquamque provinciam jus Metropolitanos singulos habere debere, nec cuiquam duas esse subjectas.—Unde, frater carissime, si ita res sunt, et ecclesiam supradictam provinciae tuae limes includit, nostra auctoritate commonitus, quod quidem facere sponte deberes, desideriis supplicantium et voluntate respecta, ad eundem locum, in quo ordinatio talis celebrata dicitur, metropolitani jure munitus, et praeceptionibus nostris fretus, accede: intelligens arbitrio tuo secundum regulas patrum quaecunque facienda sunt a nobis esse concessa; ita ut peractis omnibus, apostolicae sedi quidquid statueris te referente clarescat, cui totius provinciae liquet esse mandatam. Nemo ergo eorum [patrum] terminos audax temerator excedat.—Cesset hujusmodi pressa nostra auctoritate praesumtio eorum, qui ultra licitum suae limitem dignitatis extendunt. So too Caelestinus ep. 4. ad. Episc. prov. Vienn. et Narbon. A.D. 428.

[55] Vita Hilarii Arelat. by Honoratus Ep. Massil. (about 490 ap. Surius and Acta SS. ad. d. 5. Maji) § 22: Hilary went himself to Rome and reminded Leo, aliquos (Celidonius, &c.) apud Gallias publicam merito excepisse sententiam, et in urbe sacris altaribus interesse. Rogat atque constringit, ut si suggestionem suam libenter excepit, secreto jubeat emendari; se ad officia, non ad causam venisse; protestandi ordine, non accusandi, quae sunt acta suggerere: porro autem si aliud velit, non futurum esse molestum. Et quia tantorum virorum, praesertim jam ad supernam gratiam vocatorum, nec in narratione audeo judicia ventilare; hoc breviter tetigisse sufficiet, quod solus tantos sustinuit, quod nequaquam minantes expavit, quod inquirentes edocuit, quod altercantes vicit, quod potentibus non cessit, quod in discrimine vitae positus communioni ejus, quem cum tantis viris damnaverat, conjungi nullatenus acquievit. Auxiliaris tunc Praefectus wrote to him: Sanctos Nectarium et Constantium sacerdotes ex beatitudinis tuae parte venientes digna admiratione suscepi. Cum his saepius sum locutus de virtute animi atque constantia, contemptuque rerum humanarum, quo inter fragilitates nostras sem-

the Great (445) withdrew from him all the privileges which had been granted by the Roman see,[56] though he could not prevent Hilary and his successors from asserting their primacy.[57]

The Roman bishops were least successful in obtaining influence in *Africa*, where the ecclesiastical relations had long been firmly fixed, and there was on this account an aversion to the new movements of the hierarchy,[58] while ecclesiastical legislation had been all along improved with an evident preference for that study.[59] As early as the Pelagian controversy, Zosimus had learned by experience how little his decision was respected in Africa (§ 87, notes 12—16). It is true, he procured restoration to

per beatus es.—Locutus sum etiam cum S. Papa Leone. Hoc loco, credo, aliquantum animo perhorrescis. Sed cum propositi tui tenax sis, et semper aequalis, nulloque commotionis felle rapiaris, sicut nullis extolleris illecebris gaudiorum, ego nec minimum quidem factum Beatitudinis tuae arrogantiae memini contagione fuscari. Sed impatienter ferunt homines, si sic loquamur, quomodo nobis conscii sumus. Aures praeterea Romanorum quadam teneritudine plus trahuntur: in quam si se Sanctitas tua subinde demittat, plurimum tu nihil perditurus, acquiris. Da mihi hoc, et exiguas nubes parvae mutationis serenitate compesce. See Papst Leo's I. Streit mit d. B. v. Arles von E. G. Perthel in Illgen's Zeitschr. f. d. hist. Theol. 1843. ii. 27.

[56] Leonis M. ep. 10 (al. 89) ad Episc. provinciae Viennensis c. 4: quid sibi Hilarius quaerit in aliena provincia: et id quod nullus decessorum ipsius ante Patroclum habuit, quid usurpat? cum et ipsum, quod Patroclo a sede apostolica temporaliter videbatur esse concessum, postmodum sit sententia meliore sublatum? Cap. 7: Suis unaquaeque provincia sit contenta Conciliis, nec ultra Hilarius audeat conventus indicere synodales, et sacerdotum Domini judicia se interserendo turbare. Qui non tantum noverit se ab alieno jure depulsum, sed etiam Viennensis provinciae, quam male usurpaverat, potestate privatum. Dignum est enim, fratres, antiquitatis statuta reparari, cum is, qui sibi ordinationem provinciae indebitae vindicabat, talis in praesenti etiam probatus fuerit extitisse, ut—suae tantum civitatis illi sacerdtoium, pro sedis apostolicae pietate, praeceptio nostra servaverit.

[57] See de Marca l. c. lib. v. c. 33. Perthel l. c. S. 36 ff.

[58] Conc. Carthag. iii. ann. 398 can. 26 (Cod. Canonum Eccl. Afric. c. 39): Ut primae sedis episcopus non appelletur princeps sacerdotum, aut summus sacerdos, aut aliquid hujusmodi, sed tantum primae sedis episcopus.

[59] On the so-called Codex Canonum Ecclesiae Africanae (Voëlli et Justelli bibl. jur. can. vet. i. 320, H. Th. Bruns biblioth. ecclesiast. i. i. 155) compiled by Dionysius Exiguus from the acts of the Syn. Carthag. ann. 419, by which the decrees of former councils were confirmed, and new ones added: Gallandii de vetustis canonum collectionibus sylloge and the treatise of Coustant. c. 6 (ed. Mogont. i. 103) P. de Marca c. 4 (ibid. p. 180) Ballerini P. ii. c. 3 (ibid. p. 334).

his office for the presbyter *Apiarius* who had been then deposed, by appealing to the canons of the Sardican council as *Nicene;* but his successor, *Boniface I.* (418—423), was reminded on this account of the humility suitable to him under such circumstances.[60] But when *Caelestinus I.* (423—432) wished to have the twice-deposed Apiarius restored, the Africans in the most express terms forbade all interference,[61] and interdicted appeals to foreign bishops.[62]

[60] Conc. Afric. ep. ad Bonifac. A.D. 419 (ap. Coustant epist. Bonif. ii.): § 5. Haec (namely, the decrees of the Sardican council given out as Nicene decrees) utique usque ad adventum verissimorum exemplarium Nicaeni Concilii inserta gestis sunt. Quae si ibi—continerentur, eoque ordine vel apud vos in Italia custodirentur; nullo modo nos talia, qualia commemorare jam nolumus, vel tolerare cogeremur, vel intolerabilia pateremur. Sed credimus—quod tua Sanctitate Romanae ecclesiae praesidente non sumus jam istum typhum passuri; et servabuntur erga nos, quae nobis etiam non disserentibus custodiri debeant cum fraterna caritate, quae secundum sapientiam atque justitiam, quam tibi donavit Altissimus, etiam ipse perspicis esse servanda, nisi forte aliter se habeant canones Concilii Nicaeni. This mistake was caused by the form of the collection of canons then in use, in which those of later synods were appended to the Nicene without distinction. Quesnell has published such a collection annexed to the Opp. Leonis; also Mansi vi. 1183. Hence later canons are often cited as Nicene. See Ballerini de ant. collect. cann. P. ii. c. 1 § 3 (in Gallandii syll. ed. Mogont. i. 311). Spittler in Meusel's Geschichtsforscher iv. 72. The same author's Gesch. d. kan. Rechts S. 106.

[61] Conc. Afric. ad Caelestinum A.D. 425 (ap. Coustant epist. Caelest. ii.): § 2. Praefato itaque debitae salutationis officio, impendio deprecamur, ut deinceps ad vestras aures hinc venientes non facilius admittatis, nec a nobis excommunicatos in communionem ultra velitis excipere: quia hoc etiam Nicaeno concilio definitum facile advertat Venerabilitas tua. Nam et si de inferioribus clericis vel de laicis videtur ibi praecaveri, quanto magis hoc de episcopis voluit observari? ne in sua provincia a communione suspensi, a tua Sanctitate praepropere vel indebite videantur communioni restitui. § 3. Presbyterorum quoque et sequentium clericorum improba refugia, sicuti te dignum est, repellat Sanctitas tua: quia et nulla patrum definitione hoc ecclesiae derogatum est Africanae, et decreta Nicaena sive inferioris gradus clericos, sive ipsos episcopos suis metropolitanis apertissime commiserunt. Prudentissime enim justissimeque viderunt, quaecunque negotia in suis locis, ubi orta sunt, finienda, nec unicuique provinciae gratiam sancti Spiritus defuturam, qua aequitas a Christi sacerdotibus et prudenter videatur, et constantissime teneatur: maxime quia unicuique concessum est, si judicio offensus fuerit cognitorum, ad concilia suae provinciae vel etiam universale provocare. Nisi forte quisquam est qui credat, unicuilibet posse Deum nostrum examinis inspirare justitiam, et innumerabilibus congregatis in concilium sacerdotibus denegare. Aut quomodo ipsum transmarinum

At the close of this period *Leo I. the Great* was bishop of Rome (440—461),[63] who endeavoured theoretically to establish the rights of the Romish see both by enlarged ideas of the primacy of Peter,[64] and his inheritance derived from that source,[65]

judicium ratum erit, ad quod testium necessariae personae vel propter sexus vel propter senectutis infirmitatem, vel multis aliis intercurrentibus impedimentis, adduci non poterunt? § 4. Nam ut aliqui tanquam a tuae Sanctitatis latere mittantur, in nulla invenimus patrum synodo constitutum; quia illud quod pridem per eundem coëpiscopum nostrum Faustinum tanquam ex parte Nicaeni concilii exinde transmisistis, in conciliis verioribus, quae accipiuntur Nicaena, a S. Cyrillo coëpiscopo nostro Alexandrinae ecclesiae, et a venerabili Attico Constantinopolitano antistite ex authentico missis—non potuimus reperire. § 5. Executores etiam clericos vestros quibusque petentibus nolite mittere, nolite concedere; ne fumosum typhum saeculi in ecclesiam Christi—videamur inducere. Cf. du Pin de ant. disc. eccl. diss. ii. § 3 p. 174 ss.

[62] Concil. Milevitani ii. (ann. 416) can. 22. (the canon of a later council, also contained in Cod. can. eccl. Afric. cap. 28 and 125): Item placuit, ut presbyteri, diaconi, vel caeteri inferiores clerici, in causis quas habuerint, si de judiciis episcoporum suorum questi fuerint, vicini episcopi eos audiant, et inter eos quidquid est, finiant, adhibiti ab eis ex consensu episcoporum suorum. Quod si et ab iis provocandum putaverint, non provocent nisi ad Africana concilia, vel ad primates provinciarum suarum (for this Cod. Can. c. 28: non provocent ad transmarina judicia, sed ad primates suarum provinciarum, aut ad universale concilium, sicut et de Episcopis saepe constitutum est]. Ad transmarina autem qui putaverit appellandum, a nullo intra Africam in communionem suscipiatur. For the genuineness of the addition: sicut et de Episcopis saepe constitutum est, see de Marca lib. vii. c. 16 § 5. Similar decrees were also issued by other African councils. Comp. the citations of them in Conc. Carthag. ann. 325 (Mansi viii. p. 644): Conc. decimo, ut episcopi ad transmarina pergere non facile debeant; Conc. undecimo, qui in Africa non communicat, si ausus fuerit in transmarinis, damnetur; Conc. sextodecimo, ad transmarina qui putaverit, &c. (same as the above Can. Milev.); Conc. vigesimo, ut nullus ad transmarina audeat appellare.

[63] Leo d. S. u. s. Zeit von W. A. Arendt, Mainz 1835. 8. (a Catholic apologetic work). Papst Leo's Leben u. Lehren v. Ed. Perthel. Jena 1843. 8.

[64] Comp. the characteristic expression of Auxiliaris regarding the teneritudo aurium of the Romans at this time, not. 55 above.

[65] Leonis ep. 10. (al. 89.) ad Episc. provinciae Viennensis: Divinae cultum religionis—ita Dominus noster—instituit, ut veritas—per apostolicam tubam in salutem universitatis exiret.—Sed hujus muneris sacramentum ita Dominus ad omnium Apostolorum officium pertinere voluit, ut in beatissimo Petro, Apostolorum omnium summo, principaliter collocaret; et ab ipso, quasi quodam capite, dona sua velit in corpus omne manare: ut exsortem se mysterii intelligeret esse divini, qui ausus fuisset a Petri soliditate recedere. Hunc enim in consortium individuae unitatis assumtum, id quod ipse erat, voluit nominari, dicendo: Tu es

considerably extended the power of that see, both by his personal qualities and good fortune. The controversy with *Hilary* bishop of Arelate led him to obtain a law from *Valentinian III.* (445) by which the Romish bishop became the supreme head of the whole western church.[66] The catholic bishops of *Africa*, now oppressed by the Arian Vandals, attached themselves the more closely on this account to the Roman see, and allowed Leo to act as a patriarch in their dioceses without opposition.[67] At the council of *Chalcedon*, Leo, whose legates had the presidency there, hoped to make himself regarded as head of the whole church; but he met with much opposition among the orientals,[68]

Petrus, &c., ut aeterni templi aedificatio, mirabili munere gratiae Dei, in Petri soliditate consisteret. Hence epist. ad Anastasium Episc. Thessalonic. (Quesn. ep. 12. Baller. 14.) c. 1: Curam, quam universis ecclesiis principaliter ex divina institutione debemus. c. 11: magna ordinatione provisum est, ne omnes (episcopi) sibi omnia vindicarent; sed essent in singulis provinciis singuli, quorum inter fratres haberetur prima sententia, et rursus quidam, in majoribus urbibus constituti, sollicitudinem susciperent ampliorem, per quos ad unam Petri sedem universalis ecclesiae cura confluceret, et nihil usquam a suo capite dissideret. Epist. ad Africanos (Quesn. 1. Baller. 12.): sollicitudo, quam universae ecclesiae ex divina institutione dependimus. Leo's Leben v. Perthel S. 226.

[66] Appended to the edition of the Cod. Theodos. by Gothofredus and Ritter Novell. Theodosii tit. 24, by Hänell Novell. Valentin. iii. tit. 16, in Leonis opp. ed. Baller. epist. 11.—Cum igitur sedis apostolicae primatum sancti Petri meritum, qui princeps est episcopalis coronae, et Romanae dignitas civitatis, sacrae etiam synodi firmarit auctoritas, ne quid praeter auctoritatem sedis istius illicita praesumtio attentare nitatur. Tunc enim demum ecclesiarum pax ubique servabitur, si rectorem suum agnoscat universitas.—§ 3. Nec hoc solum, quod est maximi criminis, submovemus, verum ne levis saltem inter ecclesias turba nascatur, vel in aliquo minui religionis disciplina videatur, hac perenni sanctione censemus, ne quid tam episcopis Gallicanis, quam aliarum provinciarum contra consuetudinem veterem liceat sine viri venerabilis papae urbis aeternae auctoritate tentare. Sed hoc illis omnibusque pro lege sit, quidquid sanxit vel sanxerit apostolicae sedis auctoritas, ita aut, quisquis episcoporum ad judicium Romani antistitis evocatus venire neglexerit, per moderatorem ejusdem provinciae adesse cogatur, per omnia servatis, quae divi parentes nostri Romanae ecclesiae detulerunt.

[67] Cf. Leonis epist. ad Episc. African. (Quesn. i. Baller. xii.) Leo's Leben v. Perthel S. 30.

[68] In the very beginning of the council the legates had to declare (actio i. ap. Mansi vi. 579): Beatissime atque apostolici viri Papae urbis Romae, quae est caput omnium Ecclesiarum, praecepta habemus praemanibus, quibus praecipere dignatus est ejus Apostolatus, ut Dioscurus, Alexandrinorum Archiepiscopus, non sedeat in Concilio, sed audiendus intromittatur. Hoc nos observare necesse est. Si ergo praecipit vestra

which at last manifested itself decidedly in decreeing the bishop of Constantinople to be on an equality with the bishop of Rome. This measure Leo had foreseen, and in vain attempted to avert.[69] He protested against it;[70] and *Anatolius*, bishop of Constantinople, was actually obliged to send an humble letter to him, for the oriental emperor's sake.[71] Still the decrees of the synod continued in force; and thus began the contest of jealousy that lasted for centuries, between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople.

It is worthy of remark, that the Romish bishops were distinguished by no peculiar titles in the west. In the east, the honourable appellation of patriarchs was certainly given them; but these titles were as yet common to all bishops in the west.[72]

magnificentia, aut ille egrediatur, aut nos eximus.—Judicii sui necesse est eum dare rationem, quia cum personam judicandi non haberet, praesumpsit, et synodum ausus est facere (the Robber synod) sine auctoritate sedis apostolicae, quod nunquam licuit, nunquam factum est. They were, however, foiled in this proposition by the imperial commissioners, since they could not be accusers and judges at the same time. Dioscurus accordingly took his seat, and the legates remained—.Subsequently, the Romish legates withstood the first drawing up of the decree respecting the question of faith, desiring either that it should be made to agree more closely with the epistle of Leo, or that this epistle should be mentioned in it. On this so fearful an alarm arose, that the Illyrian bishops called out (actio v. ap. Mansi vii. 105): *οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες Νεστοριανοί εἰσιν· οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες εἰς Ῥώμην ἀπέλθωσιν.*

[69] Comp. above § 93, not. 14. The Romish legates withdrew, actio xv. was adopted, and they protested, (act. xvi.) against it, producing the instructions given them by Leo, (Mansi vii. 443): Sanctorum quoque patrum constitutionem prolatam nulla patiamini temeritate violari vel imminui, servantes omnimodis personae nostrae in vobis—dignitatem: ac si qui forte civitatum suarum splendore confisi, aliquid sibi tentaverint usurpare, hoc qua dignum est constantia retundatis. They appealed, moreover, to the sixth Nicene canon, with the Romish addition, Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum (see § 93, not. 1), but were immediately obliged to have the canon read to them in its original form, and were thus repulsed with their protest.

[70] Leonis epist. ad Marcianum, ad Pulcheriam, ad Anatalium, (ap. Quesn. ep. 78—80, Baller. ep. 104—106).

[71] In epist. Leonis ap. Quesn. appended to epist. 105, ap. Baller. ep. 132.

[72] In the west the names Papa, Apostolicus, Vicarius Christi, Summus Pontifex, Sedes Apostolica, were applied to other bishops also, and their sees (Thomassini P. I. lib. i. c. 4. Basnage praef. ad Canisii lectt. ant. T. I. p. 37. G. S. Cyprian's Belehrung vom Urspr. und Wachsthum des Papsthums S. 506 ff.) So also Patriarcha, especially to the Metropolitans. (du Pin diss. i. § 5).—Gregory I. (epist. lib. v. 18, 20, 41, viii.

30,) was mistaken in believing that at the council of Chalcedon the name universalis Episcopus was given to the bishop of Rome. He is styled *οἰκουμενικὸς ἀρχιεπίσκοπος*, (Mansi vi. 1006, 1012,) as other patriarchs also, (see above § 93, not. 20). But in another place the title was surreptitiously introduced into the Latin acts by the Romish legates. In the sentence passed on Dioscurus, actio iii. (Mansi vi. 1048,) the council say, *ὁ ἁγιώτατος καὶ μακαριώτατος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς μεγάλης ταὶ πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης Λέων*: on the contrary, in the Latin acts which Leo sent to the Gallic bishops (Leonis ep. 103, al. 82) we read: Sanctus ac beatissimus Papa, caput universalis Ecclesiae, Leo. In the older editions the beginning of Leo's epist. 97, (ap. Quesn. 134, Baller. 165,) runs thus: Leo Romae et universalis catholicaeque ecclesiae Episcopus Leoni semper Augusto salutem. Quesnel and the Ballerini, however, found in all the Codices only: Leo Episcopus Leoni Augusto. The fable, which is repeated even by the catechismus Romanus p. ii. c. 7, qu. 24, § 4, that Cyril, at the Council of Ephesus, styled the bishop of Rome Archiepiscopum totius orbis terrarum Patrem et Patriarcham, first proceeded from the St Thomae († 1274) catena aurea in Evang. ad Matth. 16, 18, who also in his opusc. contra errores Graecorum, falsely attributes many similar passages to the Greek fathers. See Launoji epistt. lib. i. ep. 1—3.

END OF VOL. I.

ANDREW JACK PRINTER

00111879

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 27 February, 2016